arXiv:1406.5985v1 [math.GT] 23 Jun 2014

COMPLEX HYPERBOLIC EQUIDISTANT LOCI

Sasha Anan′in

Abstract. We describe and study the loci equidistant from finitely many points in the so-called complex hyperbolic geometry, i.e., in the geometry of a holomorphic 2-ball $\mathbb{B}$. In particular, we show that the bisectors (= the loci equidistant from 2 points) containing the (smooth real algebraic) curve equidistant from given 4 generic points form a real elliptic curve and that the foci of the mentioned bisectors constitute an isomorphic elliptic curve.

We are going to use the obtained facts in constructions of (compact) quotients of $\mathbb{B}$ by discrete groups.

With similar technique, we also classify up to isotopy generic 3-dimensional algebras (i.e., bilinear operations) over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Briefly speaking, an algebra is classified by the (plane projective) curve D of its zero divisors equipped with a nonprojective automorphism of D. This classification is almost equivalent to the classification of the so-called geometric tensors given in [BoP] by A. Bondal and A. Polishchuk in their study of noncummutative projective planes.

To Victor Gerasimov on occasion of 50 *years of our mathematical discussions*

1. Introduction

A group $G \subset \operatorname{Isom} X$ of isometries of a simply connected (model) space X is known to be discrete iff a point $p \in X$ not fixed by any nontrivial element of G lies in the interior of the *Dirichlet polyhedron* $P := \{x \in X \mid \operatorname{dist}(x,p) \leq \operatorname{dist}(x,gp) \text{ for all } g \in G\}$ centred at p. The faces of P are frequently loci equidistant from finitely many points $p, g_1p, \dots, g_np$.

Dealing with the geometry of the holomorphic 2-ball $\mathbb{B}$, it is possible to almost recover (up to 4 real parameters corresponding to the freedom in the choice of p) a cocompact discrete group $G \subset \operatorname{Isom}\mathbb{B} = \mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ from the combinatorics of the face pairing of its Dirichlet polyhedron [Ana]. Therefore, wishing to construct such groups, it is important to study complex hyperbolic equidistant loci.

The well-known G. Giraud rigidity theorem [Gol, Theorem 8.3.3, p. 264] establishes that there are at most 3 bisectors containing the nonempty locus equidistant from 3 noncollinear points. (By definition, a bisector is the locus equidistant from 2 points.) As noted in [Gol, pp. viii, x, xiv], this theorem constitutes the main constraint on the combinatorics of Dirichlet polyhedra. Indeed, it is possible to reduce the study of discrete cocompact groups to the case where, in the tessellation of $\mathbb{B}$ by the polyhedra congruent to P, every codimension 2 face is contained in exactly 3 codimension 1 faces [Ana]. In particular, every defining relation between the face pairing isometries has length 3. Moreover, almost all conditions of Poincaré's polyhedron theorem [AGS] follow from the Giraud rigidity. In our exposition (see Lemma 4.7 and Corollary 4.8), the Giraud theorem sounds almost as 'there are at most 3 roots of a polynomial of degree 3'. In spite of this, our results can be seen as a development of the mentioned Giraud rigidity.

1.1. Bisectors and their ingredients. We follow the notation in [AGr] and [AGG] (for a background in complex hyperbolic geometry, see also [Gol]).

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 51M10 (57S30, 17A99).

Throughout the paper, V is a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear space equipped with a hermitian form $\langle -,-\rangle$ of signature $++-$ so that all negative points in the complex projective plane constitute the holomorphic 2-ball $\mathbb{B} := \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid \langle p,p\rangle < 0\}$. The distance on $\mathbb{B}$ is given by $\cosh^2 \operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2) = \frac{\langle p_1,p_2\rangle\langle p_2,p_1\rangle}{\langle p_1,p_1\rangle\langle p_2,p_2\rangle}$.

Hence, the locus equi(dis)tant from 2 distinct points $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{B}$ is given by the equation $[x,x] = 0$, where the hermitian form $[x,y] := \frac{\langle x,p_1\rangle\langle p_1,y\rangle}{\langle p_1,p_1\rangle} - \frac{\langle x,p_2\rangle\langle p_2,y\rangle}{\langle p_2,p_2\rangle}$ has rank 2. Since $[-,-] = \langle h-,-\rangle$ for a suitable (unique) $\mathbb{C}$-linear map $h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ of rank 2 such that $h^* = h$ and $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$, where h^* denotes the map adjoint to h in the sense of $\langle -,-\rangle$, we arrive at the following definition.

1.1.1. Definition. Let $h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map of rank 2 such that $h^* = h$ and $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$. Then $B_h := \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid \langle hp,p\rangle = 0\}$ is the *bisector* given by h if $B_h \neq \{f\}$, where $\{f\} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} \ker h$ is the *focus* of B_h. The projective line $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}hV = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f^{\perp}$ is the *complex spine* of B_h. Obviously, B_h is a projective cone with apex f. The projective line $S_p \subset B_h$ spanned by f and $p \in B_h \setminus \{f\}$ is the *slice* S_p of B_h generated by p. The point hp is the point polar (= orthogonal) to the slice S_p. The points polar to the slices form a geodesic $R \subset C$ called the *real spine* of B_h. The bisector B_h is *hyperbolic,spherical,* or *parabolic* if its focus f is respectively positive (i.e., $\langle f,f\rangle > 0$), negative (i.e., $f \in \mathbb{B}$), or isotropic (i.e., $f \in \mathbb{S} := \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid \langle p,p\rangle = 0\}$).

1.1.2. Remark. *Bisectors B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} coincide iff h_1, h_2 are $\mathbb{R}^*$-proportional.*

Our definition of a bisector differs from the commonly accepted one; the latter deals with the bisectors which are hyperbolic in our sense. It follows a motivation of our definition. Although a spherical bisector is singular at its focus, parts of such bisectors can still constitute smooth codimension 1 faces of fundamental polyhedra. Thus, we can work with Dirichlet polyhedra centred at positive points. The other reason is that spherical and parabolic bisectors appear naturally when we deform the usual hyperbolic ones; for example, the elliptic family of bisectors in Theorem 1.2.11 can easily contain all 3 types.

1.2. Intersection and families of bisectors. In order to motivate the concept of a family of bisectors, we begin with the following easy but useful criterion.

1.2.1. Remark. *The bisectors $B_{h_1},\dots,B_{h_n}$ are transversal at $p \in \bigcap_i B_{h_i} \setminus \mathbb{S}$ iff $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = n$ and $hp \neq 0$ for any $0 \neq h \in W$, where W stands for the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $h_1,\dots,h_n$.*

Note that the intersection in Remark 1.2.1 can be described as $\bigcap_i B_{h_i} = \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid \langle Wp,p\rangle = 0\}$.

1.2.2. Definition. An $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace $W \subset \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ is called a *family* of bisectors if $\operatorname{tr} W = 0$, $B_W \cap \mathbb{B} \neq \varnothing$, W is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $D_W := \{h \in W \mid \det h = 0\}$, and $h^* = h$ for all $h \in W$, where $B_W := \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid \langle Wp,p\rangle = 0\}$ is the *base* of the family. It is easy to see (Remark 3.4) that any $0 \neq h \in D_W$ has rank 2, i.e., B_h is a bisector. The image E_W of D_W in the real projective space $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}W$ is given by a single (possibly trivial) equation $\det = 0$. If $D_W = W$, the family is *linear.* If $D_W \neq W$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$, the family is *elliptic*; in this case E_W is a real cubic; denote by $\hat{E}_W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{C}W$ the corresponding complex plane cubic.

The algebraic map $f : E_W \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$ sending a bisector to its focus is called *focal.*

The following proposition claims that, excluding the relatively trivial case of a confocal linear family, there are two types of linear families: 1. E_W is a real projective plane of bisectors isomorphic by means of the focal map to an $\mathbb{R}$-plane; 2. E_W is a real projective space of bisectors sharing a common slice.

1.2.3. Proposition. *Let W be a* nonconfocal *(i.e., $Wf_0 \neq 0$ for any $0 \neq f_0 \in V$) linear family of bisectors. Then there exists a unique up to $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportionality $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W$. Denote $U := \mathbb{C}fW$. If $U = V$, then $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$ and $fW \subset V$ is a totally real subspace. Otherwise, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U = 2$ and the bisectors of the family share the common slice $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$, i.e., $W \subset W_U := \{h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \operatorname{tr} h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ hU \subset U^{\perp}\}$.*

1.2.4. Proposition. *With the exception of a confocal* 3- *or* 4*-dimensional linear family of bisectors with negative common focus, the base B_W completely determines a linear family W because, in this case, $W = \{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hb, b\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } b \in B_W\}$.*

1.2.5. Definition. An elliptic family W of bisectors is said to be *generic* if E_W contains no confocal line and is not a real projective line plus a point.

1.2.6. Lemma. *Let W be a generic elliptic family of bisectors. Then the focal map f can be extended to a* focal *isomorphism $\hat{f} : \hat{E}_W \to E \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$ between complex plane cubics.*

1.2.7. Definition. A generic elliptic family W of bisectors is *real* if there are 3 distinct points in E_W whose foci lie on a same complex projective line not included in E.

1.2.8. The elliptic family equitant from 4 points. Let $p_i \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$, $1 \le i \le 4$, be points of a same signature σ such that no 3 of them are on a same complex projective line. Then $w_i := \langle -, p_i\rangle p_i$, $1 \le i \le 4$, are $\mathbb{C}$-linearly independent due to an essentially unique $\mathbb{C}$-linear dependence between the p_i's. We can pick representatives such that $\langle p_i, p_i\rangle = \sigma$. Suppose that there exists $p \in \mathbb{B}$ such that $\big|\langle p, p_i\rangle\big| = 1$ for all $1 \le i \le 4$. Then $W := \big\{\sum_{i=1}^4 r_i w_i \mid r_i \in \mathbb{R},\ \sum_{i=1}^4 r_i = 0\big\}$ is an elliptic family of bisectors because $\sum_{i=1}^4 r_i w_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle -, p_i\rangle r_i p_i$ has rank 3 if $r_4 = \sum_{i=1}^3 r_i = 0$ and $r_i \ne 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$.

The constructed elliptic family W is called *equitant* from the p_i's. When $\sigma = 0$, the family W depends on the choice of representatives of the p_i's.

By Lemma 5.4, if the curve E_W of an equitant family W is not irreducible, then it is a smooth real conic plus a real projective line intersecting the conic in 2 points or it consists of 3 real projective lines sharing no common point.

1.2.9. Proposition. *An elliptic family of bisectors is equitant iff it is real.*

1.2.10. Proposition. *Let W be an equitant elliptic family of bisectors with irreducible E_W. Then the base B_W is an irreducible algebraic curve.*

The main theorem of the paper says that the bisectors containing an infinite subset of the locus equi(dis)tant from given 4 generic points of a same signature form a real elliptic curve. Under a certain angle of view, this fact is analogous to the Giraud rigidity theorem. Note that the elliptic curve can easily have bisectors of all 3 types.

1.2.11. Theorem. *Let W be an equitant elliptic family of bisectors with irreducible E_W and let $B \subset B_W$ be infinite. Then $W = \{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid h^* = h,\ \langle hb, b\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } b \in B\}$.*

1.3. Classification of 3-dimensional algebras up to isotopy. In fact, this theme is not related to the previous one, and the reader interested only in equidistant loci may simply ignore it. The one who is interested in proofs can find them in the appendix to this paper.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and let V_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, be 3-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-linear spaces. We consider the task of classifying elements in $V_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} V_2 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} V_3$ modulo the action of the group $\mathrm{GL}\, V_1 \times \mathrm{GL}\, V_2 \times \mathrm{GL}\, V_3$.

The addressed classification is equivalent to the classification of 3-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-algebras, i.e., $\mathbb{K}$-bilinear maps $b : A \times A \to A$, $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A = 3$, modulo the action of the group $\mathrm{GL}\, A \times \mathrm{GL}\, A \times \mathrm{GL}\, A$ given by the rule $b^{(g_1,g_2,g_3)}(a_1, a_2) := g_3 b(g_1^{-1}a_1, g_2^{-1}a_2)$ for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$ and $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \mathrm{GL}\, A$. Algebras in a same orbit are said to be *isotopic*. The detailed classification of 3-dimensional algebras modulo isotopy is too bulky and boring to be described here, especially if $\mathbb{K}$ is not algebraically closed. This is why we give the answer only for generic 3-dimensional algebras over an algebraically closed $\mathbb{K}$. We denote the bilinear operation b by $\cdot$.

When $d_1 \cdot d_2 = 0$ and $0 \ne d_1, d_2 \in A$, we call d_1 and d_2 nontrivial left and right zero divisors. Usually, we regard them as points in the projective plane $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$. Denote by $D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ the schemes of left/right zero divisors. The scheme D_1 is given in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ by the equation $p(x_0, x_1, x_2) = 0$, where

$p(x_0, x_1, x_2) := \det \Phi$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 (or p equals 0), $\Phi := a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2$, the elements of A are considered as left multiplications, and a_0, a_1, a_2 is a $\mathbb{K}$-linear basis in A.

1.3.1. Definition. We call a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-algebra A *generic* if the elements in D_1 and D_2 considered respectively as left and right multiplications have rank 2. For a generic A, we obtain an isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ given by the relation $d_1 \cdot d_2 = 0$. An algebra isotopic to A provides the isomorphism $i_2\varphi i_1 : D_1 \to D_2$, where i_j is a projective automorphism of D_j.

If the scheme D_1 of left zero divisors is a smooth cubic, the 3-dimensional algebra is necessarily generic because D_1 is not rational.[1] (The following obvious remark is silently used here: If $a_i \cdot L_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, then $L \cdot p = 0$, where $L_i \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ are lines, $L \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ is the line spanned by distinct $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$, and $p \in L_1 \cap L_2$.)

1.3.2. Theorem. *Let $\mathbb{K}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$.*

Up to isotopy, the 3-dimensional generic $\mathbb{K}$-algebras A whose zero divisors variety D is isomorphic to a cubic without multiple components are classified by a nonprojective automorphism of D (such an automorphism always exists) considered modulo projective automorphisms.

When D is a double line plus a line or a triple line or $D = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$, there exists a unique, up to isotopy, 3-dimensional generic $\mathbb{K}$-algebra A with the indicated D.

Briefly speaking, a generic 3-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-algebra modulo isotopy is a plane cubic D of its zero divisors equipped with a nonprojective automorphism of D.

When studying noncommutative projective planes, A. Bondal and A. Polishchuk [BoP] classified the so-called geometric tensors. This classification is almost equivalent to that of generic algebras (see [BoP, Table, p. 36] for details). The algebras whose variety of zero divisors is a smooth conic plus a line such that the isomorphism between D_1, D_2 interchanges the conic and the line constitute the difference between generic algebras and geometric tensors.

The complete classification of 4-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-algebras up to isotopy seems to be a difficult task. One can readily observe that the smooth hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3_{\mathbb{K}}$ of degree 4 (they are K3-surfaces) will occupy the place of smooth cubics. It is curious that the scheme D of zero divisors of the algebra of quaternions is the most 'degenerate' K3-surface given by the equation $(x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)^2 = 0$.

2. Basic properties of bisectors

Most of the following material is well known and can be found in [Gol] (sometimes, using different terminology and, usually, in a different exposition).

2.1. Hyperbolic, spherical, and parabolic bisectors. If h possesses a nonnull eigenvalue λ, then, in view of $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$, we have the orthogonal h-invariant decomposition $V = \ker h \oplus hV$ and the eigenvectors v_1, v_2 of h corresponding to $\lambda, -\lambda$, called *vertices* of B_h, span the complex spine $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}hV$. The bisector B_h is hyperbolic/spherical iff C has signature $+-/++$.

In both cases, B_h is the projective cone with apex f and base $C \cap B_h \neq \varnothing$. Moreover, $C \cap B_h$ is a hyperbolic/spherical geodesic and coincides with the real spine R of B_h.

Indeed, if v_1, v_2 are isotropic, then the eigenvalues $\lambda, -\lambda$ of h are purely imaginary because $0 \neq \lambda\langle v_1, v_2\rangle = \langle hv_1, v_2\rangle = \langle v_1, hv_2\rangle = -\overline{\lambda}\langle v_1, v_2\rangle$. It is easy to see that $C \cap B_h$ is the hyperbolic geodesic with vertices v_1, v_2.

If v_1 is nonisotropic, then $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and v_1, v_2 are orthogonal. We choose orthonormal representatives of v_1, v_2. When v_1, v_2 have a same signature, one can see that $C \cap B_h = \{\overline{u}v_1 + uv_2 \mid |u| = 1\}$ is a spherical geodesic. When v_1, v_2 have different signatures, the set $\{c \in C \mid \langle hc, c\rangle = 0\}$ is empty; so, this case is impossible. While p runs over the geodesic $C \cap B_h$, the point polar to the slice S_p runs over the geodesic $C \cap B_h$. This implies $R = C \cap B_h$.

[1] For any other D_1, i.e., for any non-smooth cubic D_1 (or for $D_1 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$), there exists a nongeneric algebra.

If the eigenvalues of h are all null, then $h^3 = 0$. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \ker h = 1$, the focus $\{f\} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} \ker h$ of B_h lies in the complex spine, $f \in C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} hV$, implying that $C = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f^{\perp}$ has signature $+0$ and that f is isotropic; hence, B_h is parabolic. It follows from $\langle h^2 p, hp\rangle = \langle h^3 p, p\rangle = 0$ that $C \subset B_h$.

Let $d \notin C = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} hV$. Then $h^2 d \neq 0$. So, $h^2 d = f$ and $\mathbb{R} \ni \langle hd, hd\rangle = \langle h^2 d, d\rangle \neq 0$. Taking $p := d + rhd$, we have $\langle hp, p\rangle = \langle hd, d\rangle + 2r\langle h^2 d, d\rangle = 0$ for a suitable $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $p \notin C$, we obtain a slice S_p of B_h different from C. As S_p contains an isotropic point different from f, we can assume that $f \neq p \in \mathbb{S} \cap B_h$. Let $S' := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} p^{\perp}$. Every slice S_q of B_h intersects S' in exactly 1 point and this point belongs to B_h. In other words, B_h is the projective cone with apex f and base $\Gamma := S' \cap B_h$. As $\langle h^2 p, p\rangle = \langle hp, hp\rangle > 0$ (the point hp is orthogonal to the isotropic point p, hence, is positive), we can choose a representative p such that the $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis $p, hp, h^2 p$ of V has the Gram matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0&0&1\\ 0&1&0\\ 1&0&0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Since $h = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0&0&0\\ 1&0&0\\ 0&1&0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ in this basis, one can easily see that the base Γ of the projective cone B_h is the euclidean geodesic $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} W'$, where W' is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of p, ihp. (There is no canonical choice for the geodesic Γ; see also the proofs of Lemmas 4.4.3 and 4.4.4.) The real spine R of B_h is an euclidean geodesic as well: $R = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} W$, where $W := hW'$ is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $hp, ih^2 p$.

2.2. Remark. *Let B_h be a parabolic bisector. Then there exists an isotropic point $f \neq p \in \mathbb{S} \cap B_h$ different from the focus f of B_h. For any such $p \in B_h$, the points $p, hp, h^2 p$ form a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis in V, this basis has the Gram matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0&0&1\\ 0&1&0\\ 1&0&0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ for a suitable choice of a representative $p \in V$, and $f = h^2 p$. The bisector B_h is the projective cone with apex f and base $\Gamma := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} W' = S' \cap B_h$, where W' denotes the $\mathbb{R}$-span of p, ihp, $S' := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} p^{\perp}$, and Γ is an euclidean geodesic. The real spine of B_h has the form $R = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} W$, where $W \subset V$ stands for the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $hp, ih^2 p$* ■

Conversely, using the above considerations, it is easy to see that an arbitrary geodesic serves as a real spine of some bisector. Of course, any bisector is uniquely determined by its real spine.

2.3. Remark. *Let $R = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} W$ be a geodesic, let $w, w' \in W$ be a basis in an $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace $W \subset V$ such that $\langle W, W\rangle \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $h := \langle -, w\rangle iw' - \langle -, w'\rangle iw$. Then R is the real spine of the bisector B_h.*

Proof. It is immediate that $h^* = h$, $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$, h has rank 2, $R \subset B_h$, and $hW \subset iW$.

If $\ker h \cap W = 0$, then $hW = iW$, implying that R is the real spine of B_h.

If $\ker h \cap W \neq 0$, then R is euclidean, the focus $f \in W$ of B_h is isotropic, and B_h is parabolic. We can assume that $w' = w + f$. So, $h = \langle -, w\rangle if - \langle -, f\rangle iw$. Replacing $f, w \in W$ by $\mathbb{R}^*$-proportional ones, by Remark 2.2, we can choose a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis $p, hp, h^2 p \in V$ such that $h^2 p = f$, hence, $\langle p, f\rangle = 1$. From $hp = \langle p, w\rangle if - \langle p, f\rangle iw$, $\langle hp, p\rangle = 0$, and $0 \neq \langle p, f\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, we conclude that $\langle p, w\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $hp, ih^2 p$ coincides with that of iw, if because $0 \neq \langle w, w\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ ■

Distinct projective lines are said to be *orthogonal* if their polar points are orthogonal.

2.4. Remark. *Two bisectors coincide if they have two common nonorthogonal slices.*

Proof. Such bisectors have the same real spines ■

2.5. Remark. *Let S be a projective line with the nonisotropic polar point $p \notin \mathbb{S}$ and let $f \in S$. Then there exists a unique projective line S' orthogonal to S such that $f \in S'$.*

Proof. We have $\mathbb{S} \not\ni p \in C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f^{\perp}$. The point p' polar to S' is orthogonal to p and belongs to C ■

2.6. Remark. *Let S be a slice of signature $++$ or $+-$ of a bisector B_h. Then the projective line S' orthogonal to S and containing the focus f of B_h is a slice of B_h.*

Proof. The point p polar to S is nonisotropic and belongs to the real spine R of B_h. Denote by $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f^{\perp}$ the complex spine of B_h and by p', the point polar to S'. As $p' \in C$ is orthogonal to $p \in C \setminus \mathbb{S}$, the geodesic R subject to $p \in R \subset C$ contains p' ■

Proof of Remark 1.1.2. If the bisectors are hyperbolic/spherical, the fact follows immediately from the considerations in 2.1. So, we deal with the parabolic bisectors. The bisectors have the same focus and real spine. Therefore, by Remark 2.2, we can assume that $\mathbb{R}h_1p_1+\mathbb{R}ih_1^2p_1=\mathbb{R}h_2p_2+\mathbb{R}ih_2^2p_2$, where the Gram matrices of $p_1, h_1p_1, h_1^2p_1$ and of $p_2, h_2p_2, h_2^2p_2$ equal $G:=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}0&0&1\\0&1&0\\1&0&0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. In particular, $\mathbb{R}ih_1^2p_1=\mathbb{R}ih_2^2p_2$. Replacing h_2 by an $\mathbb{R}^*$-proportional one and, if necessary, p_2 by $-p_2$, we obtain $h_1^2p_1=h_2^2p_2$. Also, we have $\pm h_1p_1=h_2p_2+2irh_2^2p_2$ for some $r\in\mathbb{R}$. Replacing p_2 by $p_2':=p_2+2irh_2p_2+2r^2h_2^2p_2$, we keep the same Gram matrix G of p_2', hp_2', h^2p_2' and obtain $h_1^2p_1=h_2^2p_2'$ and $\pm h_1p_1=h_2p_2'$. Replacing h_1 by $\pm h_1$ and writing p_2 in place of p_2', we get $h_1^2p_1=h_2^2p_2$ and $h_1p_1=h_2p_2$. In the basis $p_1, h_1p_1, h_1^2p_1$, the matrix of h_2 has the form $h_2=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}0&0&0\\w&0&0\\r&1&0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. From the equality $h_2^tG=G\overline{h}_2$ (which is nothing but $h_2^*=h_2$), we conclude that $w=1$ and $r\in\mathbb{R}$. Let $p_2=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}z\\y\\x\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. From $h_1p_1=h_2p_2$, we obtain $z=1$ and $y=-r$. So, $h_2=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}0&0&0\\1&0&0\\r&1&0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$, $p_2=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}1\\-r\\x\end{smallmatrix}\right]$, and $h_2p_2=\left[\begin{smallmatrix}0\\1\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. It follows from $\langle p_2, h_2p_2\rangle=0$ that $r=0$ ∎

2.7. Corollary. *Let B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} be distinct parabolic bisectors with a common focus $f\in\mathbb{S}$ and let $R_1, R_2\subset C:=\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f^{\perp}$ denote their real spines. The following conditions are equivalent*:

- $B_{h_1}\cap B_{h_2}\cap\mathbb{B}=\varnothing$;
- $R_1, R_2\subset C$ *are 'parallel,' i.e.,* $R_1\cap R_2=\{f\}$;
- *the* $\mathbb{R}$*-span of* h_1, h_2 *contains* $\langle -, f\rangle f$.

Proof. The first two conditions are equivalent because every slice of B_{h_i} except C has signature $+-$ and the intersection $B_{h_1}\cap B_{h_2}$ is the union of the projective lines whose polar points are in $R_1\cap R_2$.

Suppose that the $\mathbb{R}$-span of h_1, h_2 contains $\langle -, f\rangle f$. We can assume that $h_1+h_2=\langle -, f\rangle f$. If $p\in B_{h_1}\cap B_{h_2}\cap\mathbb{B}$, then $\big\langle\langle p, f\rangle f, p\big\rangle=0$, i.e., $\langle p, f\rangle=0$, a contradiction.

Let B_h be a bisector with focus f and real spine $R\subset C$ and let $h_r:=h+r\langle -, f\rangle f$, $r\in\mathbb{R}$. If h_r has rank 1, then $h_r=\langle -, q\rangle p\neq 0$. From $h_r^*=h_r$, $\operatorname{tr}h_r=0$, and $h_rf=0$, we conclude that $\langle -, q\rangle p=\langle -, p\rangle q$, $\langle p, q\rangle=0$, and $\langle f, q\rangle p=0$. In other words, $p, q\in\mathbb{R}f$, hence, $h\in\mathbb{R}\langle -, f\rangle f$ has rank ≤ 1, a contradiction. Therefore, B_{h_r} is a bisector with focus f. For any $p\in C$ different from f, we have $\langle h_rp, p\rangle=\langle hp, p\rangle+r\langle p, f\rangle\langle f, p\rangle=0$ for a suitable $r\in\mathbb{R}$ because $\langle hp, p\rangle\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\langle p, f\rangle\neq 0$. Consequently, the real spine R_r of B_{h_r}, a geodesic already known to be 'parallel' to R, passes through p. Thus, R_r, $r\in\mathbb{R}$, lists all geodesics in C that are 'parallel' to R (the geodesics on $C\setminus\{f\}$ can be seen as the geodesics on the usual euclidean plane) ∎

2.8. Slice and meridional decompositions. The *slice decomposition* of a bisector was already introduced in Definition 1.1.1: every point $p\in B_h$ different from the focus f belongs to a unique slice $S_p\subset B_h$ and two different slices intersect only in f.

Any projective line L lying in B_h is necessarily a slice. Otherwise, $f\notin L$ and B_h contains the projective cone with apex f and base L, implying that $B_h=\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$, a contradiction.

As the real spine R of B_h is a geodesic, there is a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace $W\subset V$ such that $R=\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}W$ and $0\neq\langle W, W\rangle\subset\mathbb{R}$.

Given a point $q\in B_h$ such that $f\neq q\notin C$, the point $hq\in R$ is the unique point in the real spine orthogonal to q and $hq\neq f$. We claim that R and q span the $\mathbb{R}$-plane $P_q=\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}W_q\subset B_h$, where W_q stands for the $\mathbb{R}$-span of W and a representative $q\in V$ such that $\langle W, q\rangle\subset\mathbb{R}$. Indeed, if B_h is hyperbolic/spherical, then W_q is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $W\subset f^{\perp}$ and a representative $f\in V$.

So, we assume B_h parabolic. In terms of the $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis $p, hp, h^2p\in V$ introduced in Remark 2.2, W is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of hp, ih^2p. Since $0\neq\langle ih^2p, q\rangle\in\mathbb{R}$, we can take $q=ip+rhp+ch^2p$, where $r, c\in\mathbb{C}$. It follows from $q\in B_h$ that $r\in\mathbb{R}$. Denoting $r':=\operatorname{Re}c$, we see that W_q is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of

$ip + r'h^2p, hp, ih^2p$. As the Gram matrix of $ip + r'h^2p, hp, ih^2p$ equals $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, we conclude that P_q is an $\mathbb{R}$-plane and that $P_q \subset B_h$.

The $\mathbb{R}$-plane P_q is spanned by $R \subset P_q$ and any $p \in P_q \setminus R$ different from f because $\langle p, R\rangle \neq 0$. We arrive at the *meridional decomposition* of B_h : every point $q \in B_h$ different from the focus f and not lying on the complex spine C belongs to a unique $\mathbb{R}$-plane $P_q \subset B_h$, called a *meridian* of B_h, and two different meridians intersect only in $R \cup \{f\}$, where R stands for the real spine of B_h. Note that the union of all meridians of a parabolic bisector B_h does not contain the complex spine $C \subset B_h$. (The other bisectors are unions of their meridians.)

The intersection of a slice S and a meridian M is a geodesic passing through the focus because $S \cap M = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}p^{\perp} \cap M$ is a geodesic, where $p \in R \subset M$ stands for the point polar to S.

2.9. Lemma. *Any geodesic contained in a bisector is contained in a slice or in a meridian of the bisector.*

Proof. Let $G \subset B_h$ be a geodesic in a bisector B_h.

Suppose that B_h is hyperbolic/spherical. If G intersects the real spine R of B_h, then G lies in a meridian of B_h. If two distinct points of G are in a same slice, then G is contained in this slice. So, we pick distinct points $af + bw_1, f + w_2 \in G$ such that $0 \neq \langle af + bw_1, f + w_2\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, the Gram matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} r_1 & r \\ r & r_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ of $w_1, w_2 \in R$ is real with $rr_2(r_1r_2 - r^2) \neq 0$, and $0 \neq a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, where f stands for the focus of B_h.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $af + bw_1 + x(f + w_2) \in B_h$. Therefore, $bw_1 + xw_2 \in R$ for infinitely many $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\langle bw_1 + xw_2, w_2\rangle = rb + r_2x$, we obtain $r_2\Big\langle \dfrac{bw_1 + x_1w_2}{rb + r_2x_1}, \dfrac{bw_1 + x_2w_2}{rb + r_2x_2}\Big\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ for distinct $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that $1 + \dfrac{(r_1r_2 - r^2)|b|^2}{r^2|b|^2 + rr_2(x_2b + x_1\overline{b}) + r_2^2x_1x_2} \in \mathbb{R}$ and implies $\mathbb{R} \ni x_2b + x_1\overline{b} = (x_2 - x_1)b + 2x_1 \operatorname{Re} b$, i.e., $b \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows from $\langle af + bw_1, f + w_2\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ that $a\langle f, f\rangle + br \in \mathbb{R}$ and, hence, $a \in \mathbb{R}$. As $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the points $af + bw_1, f + w_2$ lie in a meridian of B_h. Consequently, G is contained in this meridian.

Suppose that B_h is parabolic. Let $p, hp, h^2p \in V$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis with the Gram matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ (as the one introduced in Remark 2.2). Assuming that G does not lie in the complex spine C (spanned by hp, h^2p), we pick distinct nonorthogonal points $q_1, q_2 \in G \setminus C$. We can assume that $q_1 = uip + ua_1hp + b_1h^2p$, $q_2 = ip + a_2hp + b_2h^2p$ and $0 \neq \langle q_1, q_2\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, where $a_i, b_i, u \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|u| = 1$. It follows from $\langle hq_i, q_i\rangle = 0$ that $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\langle q_1, q_2\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain $u(a_1a_2 + i\overline{b}_2) - ib_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\big\langle h(q_1 + xq_2), q_1 + xq_2\big\rangle = 0$, i.e., $(a_1 - a_2)x \operatorname{Im} u = 0$. So, either $a_1 = a_2$ or $u = \pm 1$.

In the case of $u = \pm 1$, we can assume that $u = 1$ and derive $\operatorname{Re} b_1 = \operatorname{Re} b_2$ from $u(a_1a_2 + i\overline{b}_2) - ib_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $q_1 - q_2 = (a_1 - a_2)hp + (b_1 - b_2)h^2p \in \mathbb{R}hp + \mathbb{R}ih^2p$. In other words, $q_1 - q_2$ belongs to the real spine of B_h, implying that q_1, q_2 are in a meridian of B_h and that G lies in this meridian.

In the case of $a_1 = a_2$, we obtain $\overline{u}q_1 - q_2 \in \mathbb{C}h^2p$. As h^2p is the focus of B_h, the points q_1, q_2 are in a same slice of B_h. Therefore, G lies in this slice ∎

2.10. Corollary. *Any $\mathbb{R}$-plane contained in a bisector is a meridian of the bisector.*

Proof. Let $P \subset B_h$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-plane. It suffices to observe that P contains the real spine R of B_h, i.e., that the intersection $P \cap R$ has at least 3 points. Let $p \in P \setminus R$ and let $p \in G_i \subset P$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, be distinct geodesics. By Lemma 2.9, G_i is contained in a meridian R_i. Since $R \subset R_i$, we obtain $G_i \cap R \neq \varnothing$ ∎

2.11. Normal vector. Let $p \in B_h$ be a nonisotropic point in the bisector B_h different from the focus f of B_h, $p \neq f$. Then $n_p := \langle -, p\rangle hp$ is a normal vector to B_h at p. Indeed, $n_p \neq 0$ because $p \neq f$. Since $p \in B_h$, we have $\langle hp, p\rangle = 0$. Let $t := \langle -, p\rangle v \in \mathrm{T}_p\,\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$, $\langle v, p\rangle = 0$, be a tangent vector to

B_h at p. Taking the derivative $\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}$ of $\langle h(p+\varepsilon tp), p+\varepsilon tp\rangle = 0$, we obtain $\operatorname{Re}\langle hp, v\rangle = 0$. In other words, n_p is orthogonal to any vector tangent to B_h at p. In particular, the bisector B_h is smooth at its (nonisotropic) points different from the focus f.

2.12. Lemma. *Let B_h be a bisector. Denote by C and R the complex and real spines of B_h. Then, for any $c_1 \in C \setminus R$, there exists a unique $c_2 \in C \setminus R$, called the* reflection *of c_1 in R, such that $h = \langle -, c_1\rangle\frac{c_1}{r_1} + \langle -, c_2\rangle\frac{c_2}{r_2}$ for suitable $0 \neq r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ depending on representatives $c_1, c_2 \in V$. If $c_1 = hq_1$, then $r_1 := \langle q_1, hq_1\rangle$ and $r_2 := \langle q_2, hq_2\rangle$, where $c_2 := hq_2 \in C$ is uniquely determined by $\langle q_1, c_2\rangle = 0$. Moreover, c_1, c_2 have a same signature and $r_1 r_2 < 0$. Therefore, $\pm h = \langle -, c_1\rangle c_1 - \langle -, c_2\rangle c_2$ for suitable representatives $c_1, c_2 \in V$.*

Proof. Any $c \in C$ has the form $c = hp$, where p is different from the focus f of B_h. Since hp is the point polar to the slice S_p of $p \in B_h \setminus \{f\}$, we conclude that $c \notin R$ iff $p \notin B_h$.

Let $c_1 = hp_1$. As $p_1 \neq f$ and $C = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f^{\perp}$, we can define c as $\{c\} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} p_1^{\perp} \cap C$. For some $p \neq f$, we have $c = hp$. It follows from $\langle hp, p_1\rangle = 0$ that $\langle p, c_1\rangle = \langle p, hp_1\rangle = 0$.

Suppose that $c \in R$. Then $\langle p, hp\rangle = 0$ and $hp \neq hp_1$ as, otherwise, $\langle p_1, hp_1\rangle \in \langle p_1, \mathbb{C}hp\rangle = 0$, contradicting $c_1 \notin R$. So, hV is the $\mathbb{C}$-span of hp, hp_1. From $\langle p, hp\rangle = \langle p, hp_1\rangle = 0$, we deduce that $p = f$, a contradiction. Therefore, $c \in C \setminus R$.

For h of the form indicated in Lemma 2.12, we obtain $c = hp = \langle p, c_2\rangle\frac{c_2}{r_2}$. Thus, c_2 is unique.

It follows from $\langle p, hp_1\rangle = \langle p_1, hp\rangle = 0$ and $\langle f, hV\rangle = 0$ that $h' := \frac{\langle -, hp_1\rangle hp_1}{\langle p_1, hp_1\rangle} + \frac{\langle -, hp\rangle hp}{\langle p, hp\rangle}$ and h coincide on p_1, p, f. Since p_1, p, f are not in a same projective line, $h' = h$.

If $f \in \mathbb{B} \cup \mathbb{S}$, then c_1, c_2 are positive and $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$ implies $r_1 r_2 < 0$.

Consider the remaining case of a hyperbolic B_h. Pick a basis $v_1, f, v_2 \in V$ of eigenvectors of h corresponding to the eigenvalues $-ri, 0, ri$, $0 \neq r \in \mathbb{R}$, with the Gram matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Any $c \in C \setminus R$ has the form $c = h(r^{-1}iav_1 - r^{-1}iv_2) = av_1 + v_2$ with $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. Let $c_1 = av_1 + v_2$. Then $c_2 = \overline{a}v_1 + v_2$ because $\langle r^{-1}iav_1 - r^{-1}iv_2, \overline{a}v_1 + v_2\rangle = 0$. As $\langle c_1, c_1\rangle = 2\operatorname{Re} a = \langle c_2, c_2\rangle$, the points c_1, c_2 have the same signature. The matrices of $\langle -, c_1\rangle c_1$, $\langle -, c_2\rangle c_2$, h equal $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a & 0 & |a|^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \overline{a} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \overline{a} & 0 & |a|^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & a \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} -ri & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & ri \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, implying the rest ■

3. Proof of Proposition 1.2.3

This section contains a series of elementary technical linear algebra facts required mostly in the proof of Proposition 1.2.3.

3.1. Lemma. *Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field of characteristic $\neq 2$ and let K, W, A be $\mathbb{K}$-linear spaces of dimensions $3, 2, 3$, respectively, such that $K \subset W \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A$ and $K \cap (w \otimes A) \neq 0$ for every $0 \neq w \in W$. Then $W \otimes a \subset K$ for some $0 \neq a \in A$ or $K \subset W \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A'$ for some $\mathbb{K}$-linear subspace $A' \subset A$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A' \leq 2$.*

Proof. Let $w_1, w_2 \in W$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-linear basis. For some $0 \neq a_1, a_2, a, a' \in A$, we have

$$w_1 \otimes a_1, w_2 \otimes a_2, (w_1 + w_2) \otimes a, (w_1 - w_2) \otimes a' \in K.$$

If $w_1 \otimes a_1, w_2 \otimes a_2, (w_1 + w_2) \otimes a$ are linearly dependent, we have $w_1 \otimes c_1 a_1 + w_2 \otimes c_2 a_2 = (w_1 + w_2) \otimes a$ for some $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{K}$, implying $a = c_1 a_1 = c_2 a_2$ and $c_1, c_2 \neq 0$. So, $W \otimes a \subset K$ and we are done.

Therefore, we assume that $w_1 \otimes a_1, w_2 \otimes a_2, (w_1 + w_2) \otimes a$ form a basis in K. It follows that $(w_1 - w_2) \otimes a' = w_1 \otimes c_1 a_1 + w_2 \otimes c_2 a_2 + (w_1 + w_2) \otimes ca$ for suitable $c_1, c_2, c \in \mathbb{K}$. Hence, $a' = c_1 a_1 + ca$ and $-a' = c_2 a_2 + ca$, implying $c_1 a_1 + c_2 a_2 + 2ca = 0$. If a_1, a_2, a are linearly independent, we obtain $c_1 = c_2 = c = 0$ and $a' = 0$, a contradiction. Consequently, $a_1, a_2, a \in A' \subset A$ and $K \subset W \otimes A'$, where $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A' \leq 2$ ■

3.2. Corollary. *Let $W_0 \subset \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ be a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace such that $\det W_0 = 0$. Then there exist $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspaces $V_1, V_2 \subset V$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_i = i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and either $W_0 V \subset V_2$ or $W_0 V_1 = 0$ or $W_0 V_2 \subset V_1$.*

Proof. Take $\mathbb{K} := \mathbb{C}$, $W := \mathbb{C}W_0$, and $A := V$ in Lemma 3.1. The rule $\varphi : h \otimes a \mapsto ha$ defines a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map $\varphi : W \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} A \to V$. Denote $K := \ker\varphi$. If the image of φ lies in a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace $V_2 \subset V$, we have $WV \subset V_2$, hence, $W_0 V \subset V_2$. If $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} W = 1$, we can take $V_1 := \mathbb{C}f$ for $0 \neq f \in \ker h_0$ and $0 \neq h_0 \in W_0$, thus getting $W_0 V_1 \subset W V_1 = 0$. So, we can assume that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} W = 2$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} K = 3$. In order to verify the conditions of Lemma 3.1, it suffices to observe that $\det W = 0$. Let h_1, h_2 be an $\mathbb{R}$-linear basis of W_0. Then the polynomial $p(x_1, x_2) := \det(h_1 x_1 + h_2 x_2)$ vanishes for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. So, it vanishes identically. By Lemma 3.1, $Wf = 0$ for some $0 \neq f \in V$ or $K \subset W \otimes V_2$ for a suitable 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace $V_2 \subset V$. In the first case, we have $W_0 V_1 = 0$, where $V_1 := \mathbb{C}f$. In the second case, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} WV_2 = 4 - 3 = 1$, hence, $W_0 V_2 \subset V_1$, where $V_1 := WV_2$ ∎

3.3. Lemma. *Suppose that any nonnull $\mathbb{C}$-linear map from an $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace $W \subset \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ has rank 2. Then either $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} WV \leq 2$ or $Wf_0 = 0$ for some $0 \neq f_0 \in V$ or there exists a unique up to $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportionality $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W$ and, hence, $h(fh') + h'(fh) = 0$ for all $h, h' \in W$.*

Proof. It is immediate that the identity $h(fh) = 0$, $h \in W$, for an $\mathbb{R}$-linear map $f : W \to V$ implies the identity $h(fh') + h'(fh) = 0$, $h, h' \in W$. (One may substitute $h + h'$ in $h(fh) = 0$.)

Let $0 \neq h_0 \in W$ and $0 \neq f_0 \in V$ be such that $h_0 f_0 = 0$. Define $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspaces

$$N(h_0) := \{h \in W \mid \ker h_0 \subset \ker h\}, \qquad N'(h_0) := \{h \in W \mid hV \subset h_0 V\}.$$

If $N(h_0) = W$ or $N'(h_0) = W$, we are done because $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} h_0 V = 2$.

So, we assume that $U := W \setminus \big(N(h_0) \cup N'(h_0)\big) \neq \varnothing$. Let $u \in U$. We can apply Corollary 3.2 to the $\mathbb{R}$-span W_0 of h_0, u because $h_0 \in N(h_0)$ implies $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_0 = 2$. By the choice of u, there exist $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspaces $V_i \subset V$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_i = i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $W_0 V_2 \subset V_1$. Since each of h_0, u has rank 2, we obtain $\ker h_0, \ker u \subset V_2$. From $u \notin N(h_0)$, we conclude that $\ker h_0 \neq \ker u$, hence, $V_2 = \ker h_0 + \ker u$ and $V_1 = h_0(\ker u) = u(\ker h_0)$. In other words, there exists a unique $0 \neq \psi u \in \ker u$ such that $h_0(\psi u) + u f_0 = 0$. We have defined a map $\psi : U \to V$ such that $\psi u \neq 0$, $u(\psi u) = 0$, and $h_0(\psi u) + u f_0 = 0$ for all $u \in U$. It follows from the uniqueness of ψu satisfying the equality $h_0(\psi u) + u f_0 = 0$ that $\psi(ru) = r\psi u$ and $\psi(u + u') = \psi u + \psi u'$ for all $0 \neq r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u, u' \in U$ such that $u + u' \in U$. One can readily observe that ψ is continuous.

We pick an $\mathbb{R}$-linear basis $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n \in U$ of W and define an $\mathbb{R}$-linear map $f : W \to V$ by the rule $f\big(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i b_i\big) := \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \psi b_i$ for all $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then f and ψ coincide on a subset $U_0 \subset U$ dense in W. For example, one can take

$$U_0 := \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^n r_i b_i \mid r_k \neq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^k r_i b_i \notin N(h_0) \cup N'(h_0) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq n \Big\}.$$

As ψ is continuous, we obtain $\psi = f|_U$. Hence, $h(fh) = 0$ and $fu \neq 0$ for all $h \in W$ and $u \in U$.

We will show that f is unique up to $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportionality. Let $f' : W \to V$ be another nonnull $\mathbb{R}$-linear map such that $h(f'h) = 0$ for all $h \in W$. For some $h \in W$, we have $0 \neq fh, f'h \in \ker h$. Replacing f' by a $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportional one, we obtain $fh = f'h \neq 0$. The equalities $h(fh') + h'(fh) = 0$, $h(f'h') + h'(f'h) = 0$, and $fh = f'h$ imply $h(fh' - f'h') = 0$. So, $fh' = f'h'$ if $\ker h' \cap \ker h = 0$. It remains to observe that the $h' \in W$ subject to $\ker h' \cap \ker h = 0$ form a dense subset in W unless $W \ker h = 0$.

In order to show that f is an embedding, it suffices to construct f that does not vanish on a given $0 \neq h \in W$. So, it suffices to find $0 \neq h_0 \in W$ such that $h \notin N(h_0) \cup N'(h_0)$. Suppose that

$h \in N(h_0) \cup N'(h_0)$ for any $0 \neq h_0 \in W$. This means that $\ker h_0 = \ker h$ or $h_0 V = hV$ for any $0 \neq h_0 \in W$. In other words, $h_0 \in N(h) \cup N'(h)$ for any $h_0 \in W$ ■

3.4. Remark. *Suppose that $h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ satisfies $h^* = h$ and $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$. If h has rank ≤ 1, then $h \in \mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0$, where $f_0 \in V$ is isotropic.*

Proof. Suppose that h has rank 1. Then $h = \langle -, f_0\rangle v$ for some $f_0, v \in V$. From $h^* = h$ and $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$, we conclude that $\langle -, f_0\rangle v = \langle -, v\rangle f_0$ and $\langle v, f_0\rangle = 0$. So, $v = r f_0$ with $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $0 \neq r \in \mathbb{R}$ ■

The following corollary follows directly from Remark 3.4.

3.5. Corollary. *Let $U \subset V$ be a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace. Denote*

$$W_U := \big\{ h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \operatorname{tr} h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ hU \subset U^\perp \big\}. \tag{3.6}$$

If U is nondegenerate, then every $0 \neq h \in W_U$ has rank 2. If U is degenerate, then $\mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0$ is the set of all elements in W_U of rank ≤ 1, where $\mathbb{C} f_0 := U^\perp$ ■

Proof of Proposition 1.2.3. If $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} WV \leq 2$, then there exists $0 \neq f_0 \in V$ such that $\langle WV, f_0\rangle = 0$. Since $W^* = W$, we obtain $\langle V, W f_0\rangle = 0$, implying $W f_0 = 0$, a contradiction. By Lemma 3.3, we get an $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W$.

As $W f_0 \neq 0$ for all $0 \neq f_0 \in V$, we have $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U \geq 2$.

Suppose that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U = 2$. Let $0 \neq h \in W$. Then $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} hU = 1$ because $0 \neq \ker h \subset U$. Let $h' \in W$. If $fh' \notin \mathbb{C} fh$, then $h(fh') \neq 0$ and

$$\big\langle h(fh'), fh' \big\rangle = -\big\langle h'(fh), fh' \big\rangle = -\big\langle fh', h'(fh') \big\rangle = 0,$$

i.e., $\langle hU, fh'\rangle = 0$. If $fh' = c(fh)$ for $c \in \mathbb{C}$, then

$$\langle hU, fh'\rangle = \overline{c}\langle hU, fh\rangle = \overline{c}\big\langle U, h(fh)\big\rangle = 0.$$

Consequently, $\langle hU, fW\rangle = 0$ and $\langle hU, U\rangle = 0$. This means that $h \in W_U$.

Suppose that $U = V$. Let $f_i := fh_i$, $i = 1,2,3$, be a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis in V, $h_i \in W$. Denote $e_i := h_{i+1} f_{i+2}$ (the indices are modulo 3). By Lemma 3.3, $h_i f_{i+1} + h_{i+1} f_i = 0$. Since $h_i^* = h_i$ and $h_i f_i = 0$, we obtain

$$\langle f_{i-1}, e_i\rangle = \langle h_{i+1} f_{i+2}, f_{i+2}\rangle = -\langle h_{i+2} f_{i+1}, f_{i+2}\rangle = -\langle f_{i+1}, h_{i+2} f_{i+2}\rangle = 0,$$

$$\langle f_{i+1}, e_i\rangle = \langle h_{i+1} f_{i+1}, f_{i+2}\rangle = 0, \qquad \langle f_i, e_i\rangle = \langle h_{i+1} f_i, f_{i+2}\rangle = -\langle h_i f_{i+1}, f_{i+2}\rangle = -\langle e_{i-1}, f_{i-1}\rangle.$$

Denoting $c_i := \langle f_i, e_i\rangle$, we get $c_i = -\overline{c}_{i-1}$ and, consequently, $c_i = c_{i-2}$. So, $0 \neq ri := c_1 = c_2 = c_3 \in \mathbb{R}i$. Let $G := [g_{ij}]$ denote the Gram matrix of the f_i's and let $A := [a_{ij}]$ be the matrix expressing the e_j's in terms of the basis f_1, f_2, f_3, i.e., $g_{ij} := \langle f_i, f_j\rangle$ and $e_j = \sum_i a_{ij} f_i$. Then, as we have shown, $A^t G = ri$. Since $h_i f_i = 0$, $h_i f_{i+1} = e_{i-1}$, and $h_i f_{i-1} = -h_{i-1} f_i = -e_{i-2}$, in the basis f_1, f_2, f_3, we have

$$h_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a_{13} & -a_{12} \\ 0 & a_{23} & -a_{22} \\ 0 & a_{33} & -a_{32} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad h_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -a_{13} & 0 & a_{11} \\ -a_{23} & 0 & a_{21} \\ -a_{33} & 0 & a_{31} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad h_3 = \begin{bmatrix} a_{12} & -a_{11} & 0 \\ a_{22} & -a_{21} & 0 \\ a_{32} & -a_{31} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows from $\operatorname{tr} h_i = 0$ that A is symmetric, $A^t = A$. We conclude that iG is symmetric. Therefore, G is real.

Denote by W' the $\mathbb{R}$-span of h_1, h_2, h_3. We have shown that fW' is a totally real subspace. Let $h \in W \setminus W'$. We can assume that $fh \in ifW'$. In other words, $fh = ifh_1'$ with $0 \neq h_1' \in W'$. Pick an $\mathbb{R}$-linear basis $h_1', h_2', h_3' \in W'$ such that $\langle fh_1', fh_2'\rangle \neq 0$. We get a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis $fh, fh_2', fh_3' \in V$

because $fh_1', fh_2', fh_3' \in V$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis. Applying the above to h, h_2', h_3' in place of h_1, h_2, h_3, we conclude that $\langle fh, fh_2'\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, $\langle fh, fh_2'\rangle = i\langle fh_1', fh_2'\rangle \in \mathbb{R}i$, a contradiction ■

4. Linear families of bisectors and their intersections

In order to study intersections of finitely many bisectors, we need to analyze the most simple families of bisectors, the linear families. For the vast majority of such families, we show that they are determined by their intersection (Proposition 1.2.4) and that there is an $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding that maps a bisector of the family into its focus (see Proposition 1.2.3). In addition to the proofs of Remark 1.2.1 and Proposition 1.2.4, we describe the intersection of bisectors of a linear family and study the points where it is transversal (Lemmas 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.4, and 4.5.2). We also study when 2 bisectors are transversal at a common negative point (Lemma 4.6). The section ends with a version of the G. Giraud rigidity theorem (Lemma 4.7 and Corollary 4.8). The material of this section includes some facts from [Gol] presented in a more general form and under a different angle of view.

Proof of Remark 1.2.1. As the focus is a singular point of a bisector, Remark 1.2.1 holds when p is a focus of some B_{h_i}, i.e., if $h_ip = 0$ for some i. So, we assume that p is not a focus of B_{h_i} for all i. By 2.11, $n_i := \langle -, p\rangle h_ip$ is a normal vector to B_{h_i} at p. As $p \notin \mathbb{S}$, the n_i's are $\mathbb{R}$-linearly independent iff the h_ip are $\mathbb{R}$-linearly independent ■

4.1. Remark. *Let $U \subset V$ be a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace. Then W_U given by* (3.6) *equals*

$$W_U = \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hs, s\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } s \in S\big\}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $S := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$.

Proof. The $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace W_U defined by (4.2) obviously contains the one defined by (3.6). If $\langle hu, u\rangle = 0$ for all $u \in U$, then $\big\langle h(u+u'), u+u'\big\rangle = 0$ for all $u, u' \in U$ and $\mathrm{Re}\langle hu, u'\rangle = 0$, implying $\langle hu, U\rangle = 0$ because U is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace ■

Using Proposition 1.2.3, we are going to describe all linear families of bisectors and their bases.

4.3. Confocal linear families of bisectors. A linear family W of bisectors is *confocal* with the common focus $f_0 \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$ if $Wf_0 = 0$. A 2-dimensional confocal linear family of bisectors is called a *confocal line* of bisectors.

4.3.1. Lemma. *Let S be a projective line with the polar point $p \notin \mathbb{S}$ and let S' be a projective line orthogonal to S. Then*

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hs, s\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } s \in S \cup S'\big\}. \tag{4.3.2}$$

is a confocal line of bisectors with the common focus f_0 and the base $B_W = S \cup S'$, where $S \cap S' = \{f_0\}$. Moreover, $0 \neq h \in W$ iff f_0 is the focus of the bisector B_h and p belongs to the real spine of B_h.

Every confocal line of bisectors has the above form.

Proof. Let W be given by (4.3.2). By Corollary 3.5 and Remark 4.1, every $0 \neq h \in W$ has rank 2. Furthermore, p belongs to the real spine of B_h and, by 2.8, S, S' are slices of B_h, implying that f_0 is the focus of B_h. As $S \cup \{p\}$ contains a negative point and $S \cup \{p\} \subset S \cup S'$, we conclude that W is a linear family of bisectors.

Conversely, let B_h be a bisector with the focus f_0 whose real spine contains p. Then $S \subset B_h$. By Remark 2.6, S' is a slice of B_h.

Denote by $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f_0^{\perp}$ the common complex spine of the bisectors of the family. The point $p' \in C$ polar to S' is a unique point in C orthogonal to $p \in C \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Clearly, $p' \neq p$.

Every B_h, $0 \neq h \in W$, is completely determined by its real spine R and $p \in R \subset C$. The geodesics G subject to the condition $p \in G \subset C$ form a 1-parameter family and the intersection of all such geodesics equals $\{p, p'\}$. This implies $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 2$ and $B_W = S \cup S'$.

Let $h_1, h_2 \in W$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-linear basis of a confocal line W of bisectors with the common focus f_0. By Remarks 2.5 and 2.6, it suffices to show that the bisectors B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} have a common slice of signature $+-$. This is clear if $f_0 \notin \mathbb{B}$ because $B_W = B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2}$ and $B_W \cap \mathbb{B} \neq \varnothing$. Suppose that $f_0 \in \mathbb{B}$. The real spines $R_1, R_2 \subset C$ of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} intersect because any two geodesics lying in the projective line $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f_0^{\perp}$ (the common complex spine of the bisectors) of signature $++$ do so ■

4.3.3. Remark. *Let W be a confocal linear family of bisectors with a nonnegative common focus f_0, $f_0 \notin \mathbb{B}$. If $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W \geq 2$, then W is a confocal line.*

Proof. Pick a point $p \in \mathbb{B} \cap B_W$ and denote by S the projective line of signature $+-$ spanned by f_0, p. By Remark 2.5, there is a unique projective line S' orthogonal to S such that $f_0 \in S'$. By Remark 2.6, any bisector with the focus f_0 that contains S necessarily contains S'. By Lemma 4.3.1, all such bisectors form a confocal line. In other words, $W' := \big\{h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \operatorname{tr} h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ hf_0 = 0,\ \langle hp, p\rangle = 0\big\}$ is a confocal line of bisectors. It remains to observe that $W \subset W'$ ■

4.3.4. Remark. *Let W be a confocal linear family of bisectors with negative common focus f_0, $f_0 \in \mathbb{B}$. Then $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W \leq 4$. If $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W \geq 3$, then $B_W = \{f_0\}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\hat{W} := \big\{h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \operatorname{tr} h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ hf_0 = 0\big\}$ is a maximal confocal linear family of bisectors. As $i\hat{W}$ is the Lie algebra of the stabilizer $\operatorname{Stab} f_0 \simeq \mathrm{U}_2\,\mathbb{C}$ of f_0 in $\mathrm{SU}\,V$, we conclude that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{W} = 4$.

By Lemma 4.3.1, the base $B_{W'}$ of any confocal line $W' \subset \hat{W}$ is the union of orthogonal projective lines S, S' of signature $+-$, $B_{W'} = S \cup S'$, and S completely determines W' ($f_0 \in \mathbb{B}$ is fixed).

Let $W \subset \hat{W}$ be a linear family of dimension ≥ 3. Then $B_W = \{f_0\}$ because, otherwise, B_W would contain a projective line S of signature $+-$, implying that W is included in the confocal line $W' \subset W$ determined by S ■

4.4. Nonconfocal linear families of bisectors. Consider a linear family W of bisectors having no common focus. By Proposition 1.2.3, we have an $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W$. It follows from

$$\big\langle h(fh'), fh'\big\rangle = -\big\langle h'(fh), fh'\big\rangle = -\big\langle fh, h'(fh')\big\rangle = 0,$$

$h, h' \in W$, that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} fW \subset B_W$.

4.4.1. Lemma. *Let W be a linear family of bisectors whose foci do not lie in a same projective line. Then the foci of the bisectors of the family form an $\mathbb{R}$-plane P, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$, $B_W = P$, and*

$$W = \big\{h \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \operatorname{tr} h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hp, p\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } p \in P\big\}.$$

Conversely, given an $\mathbb{R}$-plane P, the above formula defines a nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci constitute P.

No 3 bisectors of such a family are transversal at any $p \in P \setminus \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. By Proposition 1.2.3 and the beginning of 4.4, $\mathbb{C}fW = V$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$, and the bisectors B_h, $0 \neq h \in W$, have a common $\mathbb{R}$-plane $P := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} fW$. Moreover, P determines W and all bisectors that contain P have the form B_h, $0 \neq h \in W$. Indeed, by 2.1, every bisector B is determined by its real spine R which can be an arbitrary geodesic. If $P \subset B$, then, by Corollary 2.10, $R \cup \{f\} \subset P$, where f stands for the focus of B. As $R = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} f^{\perp} \cap P$, a bisector B containing P is completely determined by its focus $f \in P$ which can be an arbitrary point in P. We call such a family W an $\mathbb{R}$-*plane* of bisectors.

Let $p \notin P$ and let $\Gamma := P \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}p^{\perp}$. If Γ is a geodesic, then the point p polar to the projective line of Γ belongs to P, a contradiction. Therefore, there is a geodesic $G \subset P$ such that $G \cap \Gamma = \varnothing$, i.e., $G \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}p^{\perp} = \varnothing$, implying that the bisector B with the real spine G does not contain p. As $P \subset B$, we have shown that $B_W = P$.

Conversely, let P be an $\mathbb{R}$-plane. Then

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hp, p\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } p \in P\big\}$$

is an $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace. In view of the above considerations, in order to show that W is a linear family of bisectors, it suffices to observe that $\det W = 0$. Let $U \subset V$ be a totally real subspace such that $P = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$ and let $h \in W$. From $h^* = h$ and $\big\langle h(u_0+u_1), u_0+u_1\big\rangle = 0$ for all $u_0, u_1 \in U$, we infer $\mathrm{Re}\langle hu_0, u_1\rangle = 0$. It follows that $hU \subset iU$. Hence, there exists $\varphi \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{R}}(U,U)$ such that $hu = i\varphi u$ for all $u \in U$. From $\langle hu_0, u_1\rangle = \langle u_0, hu_1\rangle$ for $u_0, u_1 \in U$, we conclude that $\langle \varphi u_0, u_1\rangle + \langle u_0, \varphi u_1\rangle = 0$. In other words, $\varphi + \varphi^* = 0$, where φ^* stands for the adjoint to φ in the sense of the form $\langle -, -\rangle$ restricted on U. It is well known (and can be easily verified with a straightforward calculation) that all elements in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{o}\,U$ of the orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}\,U = \mathrm{O}(2,1)$ are degenerate. Hence, φ is degenerate and so is h.

By Remark 1.2.1, no 3 bisectors in W are transversal at any $p \in P \setminus \mathbb{S}$ ■

4.4.2. Lemma. *Let S be a projective line with the polar point $p \notin \mathbb{S}$. Then*

$$W_S := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hs, s\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } s \in S \cup \{p\}\big\}$$

is a 4-dimensional (maximal) nonconfocal family of bisectors and $B_{W_S} = S \cup \{p\}$.

Conversely, any 4-dimensional (maximal) nonconfocal family of bisectors has the above form.

No 4 bisectors of such a family are transversal at any $s \in S \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Any 4 bisectors that span the family are transversal at p.

Proof. Let $U \subset V$ be a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace such that $S = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$. Clearly, $W_S \subset W_U$. By Corollary 3.5 and Remark 4.1, every $0 \neq h \in W_U$ provides a bisector B_h containing S. Therefore, p belongs to the real spine of B_h, hence, $p \in B_h$. Consequently, $p \in B_{W_U}$ and $W_S = W_U$. Since $S \cup \{p\}$ contains a negative point, W_S is a linear family of bisectors. It cannot be confocal because $\mathrm{PU}\,V$ acts transitively on points of a same signature in S. By Proposition 1.2.3, we obtain an $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W_S \hookrightarrow U$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W_S$.

Let $f_0 \in S$ be nonisotropic. By Remark 2.5, we find a projective line S' orthogonal to S such that $f_0 \in S'$. By Lemma 4.3.1, (4.3.2) defines a confocal line W of bisectors with the common focus f_0 and $S \subset B_W$. Hence, $W \subset W_S$ and $fW \subset \mathbb{C}f_0$. Therefore, $fW = \mathbb{C}f_0$. Taking other nonisotropic points $f_0 \in S$, we conclude that $fW_S = U$. In particular, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_S = 4$ and W_S is a maximal linear family of bisectors.

Let us show that $B_{W_S} = S \cup \{p\}$. Take any $q \notin S \cup \{p\}$ and pick $f_0 \in S \setminus \mathbb{S}$ not belonging to the projective line joining p, q. Denote by $L(f_0, q)$ the projective line joining f_0, q and let $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f_0^{\perp}$. Then $p \in C \not\ni f_0$ because $f_0 \notin \mathbb{S}$. Since f_0, p, q are not on a same projective line, we have $L(f_0, q) \cap C = \{d\}$ and $d \neq p$. Pick a geodesic $R \subset C$ such that $p \in R \not\ni d$. Then R is a real spine of some bisector B_h, f_0 is the focus of B_h, and S is a slice of B_h because $p \in R$. So, $h \in W_U$. On the other hand, $q \notin B_h$ as, otherwise, $L(f_0, q) \subset B_h$ and $d \in R$.

The converse follows from Proposition 1.2.3, Corollary 3.5, and the beginning of 4.4.

By Remark 1.2.1, no 4 bisectors in W_S are transversal at any $s \in S \setminus \mathbb{S}$ and any 4 bisectors that span W_S are transversal at p ■

4.4.3. Lemma. *Let Γ be a geodesic and let $p \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Then*

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in S \cup \Gamma\big\}.$$

is a 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci belong to the projective line S with the polar point $p \notin \mathbb{S}$. We have $B_W = S \cup \Gamma$.

Conversely, any 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci lie in a noneuclidean projective line has the above form.

No 3 bisectors of such a family are transversal at any $s \in S \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Any 3 bisectors that span the family are transversal at any $g \in \Gamma \setminus (\mathbb{S} \cup S)$.

Proof. Let W be a 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci lie in a projective line S with polar point $p \notin \mathbb{S}$ and let $U \subset V$ be a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace in V such that $S = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$. Then, by Proposition 1.2.3 and the beginning of 4.4, $W \subset W_S$ and there is an $\mathbb{R}$-linear isomorphism $f : W_S \to U$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W_S$.

Clearly, $fW \cap ifW = \mathbb{C}f_0$ for some $f_0 \in U$. So, $fW = \mathbb{C}f_0 + \mathbb{R}q$. If $f_0 \notin \mathbb{S}$, we choose q orthogonal to f_0. If $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$, then we can choose q such that $f_0 \neq q \in S \cap \mathbb{S}$ because $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}fW = S$. Thus, we assume that $f_0, p, q \in V$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis either orthogonal or with the Gram matrix $G := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Let $W' := f^{-1}(\mathbb{C}f_0)$ and $h := f^{-1}(q)$. By Lemma 4.3.1, $B_{W'} = S \cup S'$, where S' is the projective line spanned by f_0, p. Since $f_0 \neq q \in S$, the focus q of B_h does not belong to S' and, therefore, B_h is the projective cone with the apex q and the base $\Gamma := S' \cap B_h$. As S is a slice of B_h and $f_0 \in S$, we have $f_0, p \in B_h$, hence, $f_0, p \in \Gamma$. We claim that Γ is a geodesic. Indeed, if f_0, p, q are orthogonal, then Γ is simply the real spine of B_h. If f_0, p, q have the Gram matrix G, then B_h is parabolic, $q \neq f_0 \in \mathbb{S} \cap B_h$, and $S' = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f_0^{\perp}$. By Remark 2.2, Γ is an euclidean geodesic. It follows that $B_W = B_{W'} \cap B_h = (S \cup S') \cap B_h = S \cup \Gamma$.

Conversely, let Γ be a geodesic and let $p \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Then

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in S \cup \Gamma\big\} \subset W_S,$$

where $S := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}p^{\perp}$. We will show that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$ and $B_W = S \cup \Gamma$.

Let $\{f_0\} := S \cap \Gamma$, let S' denote the projective line spanned by f_0, p (so, S and S' are orthogonal), and let W' be given by (4.3.2). Then $\Gamma \subset S'$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W' = 2$, $B_{W'} = S \cup S'$, and $W' \subset W \subsetneq W_S$ by Lemma 4.3.1 because $B_W \supset \Gamma \not\subset B_{W_S}$.

Suppose that $f_0 \notin \mathbb{S}$. Then we have an orthogonal $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis f_0, p, q, where $q \in S$ is the focus of the bisector B_h with the real spine Γ and complex spine S'. It follows from $p \in \Gamma$ and $S' \not\subset B_h$ that $h \in W$ and $h \notin W'$. Hence, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_0 = 3$ and $B_W = B_{W'} \cap B_h = S \cup \Gamma$.

Suppose that $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$. Then S is hyperbolic. Pick points d, q such that $f_0, p \neq d \in \Gamma$ and $f_0 \neq q \in \mathbb{S} \cap S$ and consider the projective line $C := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}q^{\perp}$ of signature $+0$. It follows from $q \notin \Gamma$ that $d \neq q$; denote by b the point polar to the projective line $L(d, q)$ spanned by d, q. Then the points $b, p, q \in C$ are pairwise distinct because they are the points polar to the projective lines $L(d, q), S, C$, each line contains q, which are distinct because their intersections with S', $q \notin S'$, are respectively $d, f_0, p \in \Gamma$. Since $S \cap C = \{q\}$ and $q \neq b \in C$, we see that $b \notin S$, implying that the distinct points $b, p \in C$ are not orthogonal. Hence, there exists a unique geodesic R such that $b, p \in R \subset C$. As any geodesic in C contains q, we obtain $b, p, q \in R$. Denote by B_h the (parabolic) bisector with the real spine R. Then $L(d, q), S, C$ are slices and q is the focus of B_h. From $q \notin S' = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}f_0^{\perp}$ and $f_0 \in S \subset B_h$, we conclude that $f_0 \in \mathbb{S} \cap B_h$ and, by Remark 2.2, that $S' \cap B_h$ is a geodesic. The geodesics $S' \cap B_h$ and Γ coincide because they have 3 common points d, f_0, p. So, $h \in W \setminus W'$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_0 = 3$, and $B_W = B_{W'} \cap B_h = S \cup \Gamma$.

By Remark 1.2.1, no 3 bisectors in W_S are transversal at any $s \in S \setminus \mathbb{S}$ and any 3 bisectors that span W are transversal at any $g \in \Gamma \setminus (\mathbb{S} \cup S)$ ∎

4.4.4. Lemma. *Let $f_0 \in \Gamma$ be a vertex of a hyperbolic geodesic Γ. Then*

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in \Gamma \cup S'\big\}$$

is a 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci belong to the projective line S' with the polar point $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$. We have $B_W = \Gamma \cup S'$.

Conversely, any 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family of bisectors whose foci lie in an euclidean projective line has the above form. Also, such families are exactly the 1-codimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspaces $W \subset W_U$ subject to $\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0 \notin W$, where $U := f_0^\perp$ and $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$.

No 3 bisectors of such a family are transversal at any $s \in S' \setminus \{f_0\}$. Any 3 bisectors that span the family are transversal at any $g \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Let $f_0 \in \mathbb{S}$. Denote $U := f_0^\perp$ and $S' := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$. By Remark 4.1 and Corollary 3.5, B_h is a bisector containing S' iff $h \in W_U \setminus \mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0$. Given $p \in S'$, denote $W_p := \{h \in W_U \mid hp = 0\} \ni \langle -, f_0\rangle f_0$. When $p \neq f_0$, a bisector B_h, $h \in W_p \setminus \mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0$, is determined by its real spine which can be any (hyperbolic) geodesic R subject to $f_0 \in R \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}p^\perp$. For a fixed $p \neq f_0$, such R's form a 1-parameter family, hence, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_p = 2$. When $p = f_0$, the real spine of B_h, $0 \neq h \in W_{f_0}$, is an arbitrary geodesic $R \subset S'$. As the family of such geodesics is 2-dimensional, we conclude that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_{f_0} = 3$. Varying $p \in S'$, we arrive at $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W_U = 4$.

Let $W_0 \subset W_U$ be a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace such that $W_0 \cap \mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0 = 0$. The bisectors from W_0 cannot be all confocal because $W_0 \not\subset W_p$ for any $p \in S'$ in view of dimension and $\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0 \notin W_0$. By Proposition 1.2.3, we obtain an $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W_0 \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W_0$. For some $p \in S'$, we have $fW_0 \cap ifW_0 \supset \mathbb{C}p$, hence, $f^{-1}(\mathbb{C}p) \subset W_p$. From $f^{-1}(\mathbb{C}p) \not\ni \langle -, f_0\rangle f_0 \in W_p$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} f^{-1}(\mathbb{C}p) = 2$, we conclude that $p = f_0$. Therefore, $\mathbb{C}f_0 \subset fW_0$ and $W' := f^{-1}(\mathbb{C}f_0)$ is a confocal line of bisectors with the common focus f_0. By Lemma 4.3.1, $B_{W'} = S \cup S'$, where S is a projective line whose polar point p belongs to S', $f_0 \neq p \in S'$, implying $f_0 \in S \cap S'$. From $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}fW_0 = S'$, we obtain $p = fh$ for some $h \in W_0 \setminus W'$, hence, $W_0 = \mathbb{R}h + W'$. In other words, p is the focus of the (hyperbolic) bisector B_h, S is the complex spine of B_h, S' is a slice of B_h, and the hyperbolic geodesic $\Gamma := B_h \cap S \ni f_0$ is the real spine of B_h. Consequently, $B_{W_0} = B_h \cap B_{W'} = B_h \cap (S \cup S') = \Gamma \cup S'$ because $S' \subset B_h$. It follows that W_0 is a maximal linear family of bisectors.

Let W be a 3-dimensional nonconfocal linear family W of bisectors whose foci lie in a S'. Then, by the beginning of 4.4, $W \subset W_U$. By the above, $B_W = \Gamma \cup S'$, where $f_0 \in \Gamma$ is a hyperbolic geodesic.

Conversely, let $f_0 \in \Gamma$ be a vertex of a hyperbolic geodesic Γ. Put $U := f_0^\perp$, $S' := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$, and

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in \Gamma \cup S'\big\}.$$

From $\Gamma \cap \mathbb{B} \neq \varnothing$, we infer that $W \subset W_U$ is a linear family of bisectors. By Remark 4.1 and Corollary 3.5, $W \cap \mathbb{R}\langle -, f_0\rangle f_0 = 0$. Let S denote the projective line of Γ. Then S, S' are orthogonal and $S \cap S' = \{f_0\}$. By Lemma 4.3.1, we obtain a confocal line $W' \subset W$ of bisectors with the common focus f_0. Thus, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 3$ because $h \in W \setminus W'$, where B_h is the bisector with the real spine Γ.

By Remark 1.2.1, no 3 bisectors in a linear family W in question are transversal at any $s \in S' \setminus \{f_0\}$ and any 3 bisectors that span W are transversal at any $g \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{S}$ ■

4.5. Nonconfocal lines of bisectors. A nonconfocal 2-dimensional linear family W of bisectors is called a *nonconfocal line* of bisectors. By Proposition 1.2.3, there exists a unique up to $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportionality $\mathbb{R}$-linear embedding $f : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that $h(fh) = 0$ for all $h \in W$ and $W \subset W_U$, where $U := \mathbb{C}fW$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U = 2$. By Corollary 3.5 and Remark 4.1, we get a common slice $S := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U \subset B_W$ of the bisectors of W; denote by p the point polar to S. The circle $L := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}fW \subset S$ (independent of the choice of f) is called the *singular circle* of the nonconfocal line of bisectors.

4.5.1. Definition. Let $T \subset V$ be a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace such that $V = \mathbb{C}T$. The real projective plane $Q := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}T$ is called a *geodesic cone* if Q contains at least two geodesics. Let p be the intersection of geodesics $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 \subset Q$. Then any real projective line Γ' such that $p \in \Gamma' \subset Q$ is a geodesic. Indeed, $\Gamma_i = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}T_i$ and T is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $p, d_0, d_1 \in V$, where T_i stands for the $\mathbb{R}$-span of p, d_i and

$\langle p, d_i\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 0, 1$. Hence, $\Gamma' = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}T'$, where T' is the $\mathbb{R}$-span of p, d' and d' belongs to the $\mathbb{R}$-span of d_0, d_1. Thus, $\langle p, d'\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ and Γ' is a geodesic.

Of course, any $\mathbb{R}$-plane is a geodesic cone. If a geodesic cone Q contains an extra geodesic Γ, $p \notin \Gamma \subset Q$, then Q is an $\mathbb{R}$-plane because we can take for d_i the intersection $\Gamma \cap \Gamma_i$ and thus obtain the $\mathbb{R}$-linear basis p, d_0, d_1 in T with the real Gram matrix. We call p the *apex* of the geodesic cone Q. When Q is an $\mathbb{R}$-plane, every $p \in Q$ serves as an apex of Q.

4.5.2. Lemma. *Let Q be a geodesic cone with apex p and let S be a projective line with the polar point p. Then*

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in S \cap Q\big\}$$

is a nonconfical line of bisectors, $B_W = S \cup Q$, and the singular circle of W equals $L := S \cap Q$.

Conversely, any nonconfocal line of bisectors has the above form.

No 2 bisectors of such a family are transversal at any $l \in L \setminus \mathbb{S}$. Any 2 bisectors that span the family are transversal at any $d \in (S \cap Q) \setminus (L \cup \mathbb{S})$.

Proof. Let W be a confocal line of bisectorts. By Lemmas 4.4.2, 4.4.3, and 4.4.4, there are distinct 3-dimensional linear families $W_0, W_1 \subset W_U$ of bisectors such that $W = W_0 \cap W_1$. It follows from $B_{W_i} = S \cup \Gamma_i$, $i = 0, 1$, that $S \cup \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1 \subset B_W$. The geodesics Γ_i's are distinct because the W_i's are distinct; both geodesics contain the point polar to S.

It follows from $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = 2$ and from the identity $h(fh) = 0$, $h \in W$, that $W(fW)$ is a 1-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear space. Hence, $W(fW) = \mathbb{R}p$ for a suitable representative $p \in V$; this is the point polar to S because $h(U) = \mathbb{C}p$ for any $0 \neq h \in W$. Consequently, $p \in \Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_1$.

Pick $d_0 \in \Gamma_0 \setminus S$ such that $0 \neq \langle p, d_0\rangle \in \mathbb{R}i$ and let T stand for the $\mathbb{R}$-span of d_0, fW. Clearly, $Q := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}T$ is a real projective plane.

We claim that $B_W = S \cup Q$. Indeed, any point in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \setminus S$ has the form $d_0 + fw + ifw'$ with $w, w' \in W$. As $\langle hS', S'\rangle = 0$ for every slice S' of an arbitrary bisector B_h, we have $\langle hS, S\rangle = 0$ for all $h \in W$. Therefore, for any $h \in W$, we obtain $\big\langle h(fw + ifw'), fw + ifw'\big\rangle = 0$ and, in view of $\langle hd_0, d_0\rangle = 0$,

$$\big\langle h(d_0 + fw + ifw'), d_0 + fw + ifw'\big\rangle = \langle hd_0, fw + ifw'\rangle + \big\langle h(fw + ifw'), d_0\big\rangle =$$

$$= 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,\big\langle h(fw + ifw'), d_0\big\rangle = 2i\big\langle h(fw'), d_0\big\rangle$$

due to $h(fw) \in \mathbb{R}p$ and $\langle p, d_0\rangle \in \mathbb{R}i$. It follows that $d_0 + fw + ifw' \in B_W$ iff $W(fw') = 0$, i.e., iff $w' = 0$.

Since $S \not\supset \Gamma_i \subset B_W$, we conclude that $\Gamma_i \subset Q$. In other words, Q is a geodesic cone with the apex p.

Clearly, $U \cap T \supset fW$ provides a real projective line inside $S \cap Q$. Since $S \cap Q = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}(p^{\perp} \cap T)$ is a real projective line, we see that $S \cap Q$ is the singular circle of W.

Conversely, let Q be a geodesic cone with the apex p. Put $U := q^{\perp}$, $S := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}U$, and

$$W := \big\{h \in \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V) \mid \mathrm{tr}\, h = 0,\ h^* = h,\ \langle hd, d\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } d \in S \cap Q\big\}.$$

Pick two distinct geodesics $p \in \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 \subset Q$ such that $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 \not\subset S$. By Lemmas 4.4.2, 4.4.3, and 4.4.4, we obtain distinct 3-dimensional linear families $W_0, W_1 \subset W_U$ of bisectors such that $B_{W_i} = S \cup \Gamma_i$, $i = 0, 1$, and $W \subset W' := W_0 \cap W_1$. Since $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1 \subset Q'$ and $B_{W'} = S \cup Q'$, where Q' is a geodesic cone with the apex p, we conclude that $Q' = Q$ and $W = W'$.

By Remark 1.2.1, no 2 bisectors in W are transversal at any $l \in L \setminus \mathbb{S}$ and any 2 bisectors that span W are transversal at any $d \in (S \cup Q) \setminus (L \cup \mathbb{S})$ ∎

We warn the reader that, in general, the geodesics Γ such that $p \in \Gamma \subset Q$ have nothing to do with the list of real spines of the bisectors of the family W. Note also that it is quite possible that $L \cap (\mathbb{B} \cup \mathbb{S}) = \varnothing$; see, for example, [AGG, p. 38, Criterion 4.3.3].

When $p \notin \mathbb{S}$, the $\mathbb{R}$-linear isomorphism $f : W_U \to U$ (unique up to $\mathbb{C}^*$-proportionality) provides the map $\pi : \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{R}}(2, W_U) \to \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{C}|\mathbb{R}}(2, U)$ from the grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{R}}(2, W_U)$ of 2-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspaces in W_U onto the $\mathbb{C}$-grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{C}|\mathbb{R}}(2, U)$ of the circles in S (see the end of [AGr, Examples 1.7]). The map π sends $W \in \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{R}}(2, W_U)$ onto the common focus $f_W \in S \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{C}|\mathbb{R}}(2, U)$ of W, $\{f_W\} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} fW$, if W is a confocal line, and onto the circle $L_W := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} fW \in \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{C}|\mathbb{R}}(2, U)$, otherwise. Outside the boundary S of the $\mathbb{C}$-grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathbb{C}|\mathbb{R}}(2, U)$ the map π is an U_1-bundle because we can describe the geodesic cone Q such that $B_W = S \cup Q$ as $Q := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}} T$, where $T := \mathbb{R}p + fW$ and $p \in V$ is a suitable representative.

4.5.3. Corollary. *Any line of bisectors have a common slice* ■

Proof of Proposition 1.2.4. We just summarize Lemma 4.3.1, Remark 4.3.3, Lemmas 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.4, and 4.5.2 and take into account Remark 4.3.4 ■

4.6. Lemma. *Let $p \in B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2}$ be a negative point different from the foci of bisectors B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}. If B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} are not transversal at p, then B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} belong to a nonconfocal line of bisectors and p lies on the singular circle of the line, hence, on a common slice of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}.*

Proof. We can assume that the $\mathbb{R}$-span W of h_1, h_2 is 2-dimensional. By Remark 1.2.1, p is the focus of a spherical bisector B_h, $0 \neq h \in W$. We can assume that $h = h_2 - h_1$. Hence, $h_1 p = h_2 p \in p^\perp$ and h admits a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis of orthonormal eigenvectors p, v_1, v_2 with eigenvalues $0, \lambda, -\lambda$, $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We can choose representatives such that $h_1 p = h_2 p = a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2 \neq 0$ with $a_1, a_2 \geq 0$. In terms of the basis p, v_1, v_2, the condition that $H^* = H$ for $H := [h_{ij}]$ takes the form

$$h_{11} = \overline{h}_{11}, \qquad h_{22} = \overline{h}_{22}, \qquad h_{33} = \overline{h}_{33}, \qquad h_{12} = -\overline{h}_{21}, \qquad h_{13} = -\overline{h}_{31}, \qquad h_{23} = \overline{h}_{32}.$$

Taking into account that $\operatorname{tr} h_1 = 0$, we obtain $h_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -a_1 & -a_2 \\ a_1 & r & \overline{c} \\ a_2 & c & -r \end{bmatrix}$ and $h_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -a_1 & -a_2 \\ a_1 & r+\lambda & \overline{c} \\ a_2 & c & -r-\lambda \end{bmatrix}$, where $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\det h_1 = (a_2^2 - a_1^2)r - 2a_1 a_2 \operatorname{Re} c$, $\det h_2 = (a_2^2 - a_1^2)(r + \lambda) - 2a_1 a_2 \operatorname{Re} c$, and $\lambda \neq 0$, we conclude from $\det h_1 = \det h_2 = 0$ that $a_1^2 = a_2^2$ and $a_1 a_2 \operatorname{Re} c = 0$. So, $a_1 = a_2 \neq 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}i$ because $a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2 \neq 0$ and $a_1, a_2 \geq 0$. It follows that $\det W = 0$. Therefore, W is aline of bisectors.

By Remark 1.2.1, the only singular point in the base of a confocal line of bisectors is the common focus of the family. So, W is not confocal. The rest follows from Lemma 4.5.2 ■

4.7. Lemma. *Let $p \in B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2}$ be a negative point different from the foci of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} that lies neither in a common slice nor in a common meridian of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}. If $B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2} \cap U \subset B_{h_3}$ for an open neighbourhood $U \ni p$, then h_3 belongs to the $\mathbb{R}$-span of h_1, h_2.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, we can assume that $p \in D := B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2} \cap U$ is a smooth surface and that $U \subset \mathbb{B}$.

Suppose that the $\mathbb{R}$-span W of h_1, h_2, h_3 is 3-dimensional.

By Remark 1.2.1, every $d \in D$ is a focus of some bisector B_{h_d}, $h_d \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}} W$. As B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} are transversal at any $d \in D$, such a h_d is unique by Remark 1.2.1. The algebraic map $\psi : D \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}} W$ given by the rule $\psi : d \mapsto h_d$ is injective because every h_d has rank 2. As the image of ψ is Zariski dense, $\det W = 0$. So, W is a linear family of bisectors. By Lemma 4.3.1, B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} cannot have a common focus since p does not lie in a common slice of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}. The family W cannot be a one described in Lemma 4.4.3 or Lemma 4.4.4 because p does not lie in a common slice of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} and $D \subset B_W$. Consequently, W is an $\mathbb{R}$-plane of bisectors and $p \in D \subset B_W$ belongs to a common meridian B_W of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} by Lemma 4.4.1 and Corollary 2.10, a contradiction ■

4.8. Corollary (G. Giraud rigidity theorem)**.** *Let B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} be bisectors having no common slice and such that $D := B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2} \cap \mathbb{B} \neq \varnothing$. Then D is a smooth surface (possibly except at a single point,*

the focus of some B_{h_i}) and there exists at most one more bisector B_{h_3} that contains a given nonempty open subset $\varnothing \neq U \subset D$. Such a B_{h_3} contains $B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2}$.

Proof. Since the bisectors B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} have no common slice, they cannot be confocal by Lemma 4.3.1 and D cannot contain both foci of B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}. Suppose that $D = \{f_1\}$, where f_1 is the focus of B_{h_1}. Pick slices $S_i \subset B_{h_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \{f_1\}$. As f_1 is not the focus of B_{h_2}, the intersection $S_1 \cap S_2'$ is a negative point different from f_1 for any slice $S_2' \subset B_{h_2}$ close to S_2, a contradiction.

By Lemma 4.6, B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} are transversal at any $p \in D \setminus \{f\} \neq \varnothing$, where f is the focus of B_{h_1} or of B_{h_2}. So, $D \setminus \{f\}$ is a smooth surface. Denote by W the $\mathbb{R}$-span of h_1, h_2. By Corollary 4.5.3, W cannot be a line of bisectors. In particular, by Lemma 4.4.1, B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} cannot have a common meridian. By Lemma 4.7, $h_3 \in W$. As W is not a line of bisectors, the homogeneous polynomial $\det(h_1 x_1 + h_2 x_2)$ of degree 3 does not vanish identically ∎

5. Elliptic families of bisectors and equidistant loci

Besides the proofs of Lemma 1.2.6, Propositions 1.2.9 and 1.2.10, and Theorem 1.2.11, in this section, we find a criterion when a real projective line study is tangent to an elliptic family E_W of bisectors (Lemma 5.1), characterize singular points of a family E_W equitant from 4 points, and describe the zoology of equitant families in terms of the linear dependence between the points (Lemma 5.4).

5.1. Lemma. *Let $B_h, B_{h'}$ be distinct bisectors such that $\det W \neq 0$, where W denotes the $\mathbb{R}$-span of h, h'. Then one of the following alternatives takes place.*

- *There exist pairwise distinct points p_1, p_2, p_3 such that $\langle -, p_i\rangle p_i - \langle -, p_{i+1}\rangle p_{i+1}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ (the indices are modulo 3), are unique up to $\mathbb{R}^*$-proportionality nonnull elements of rank ≤ 2 in W.*
- *The elements h, h' are unique up to $\mathbb{R}^*$-proportionality nonnull elements of rank ≤ 2 in W and one of the bisectors $B_h, B_{h'}$ contains the focus of the other.*

In the latter case, under the assumption that the focus of $B_{h'}$ belongs to B_h (which is equivalent to the assumption that the real spine of B_h intersects the complex spine of $B_{h'}$), we have $\det(hx + h'x') = rx^2x'$ with $r \neq 0$.

Proof. The bisectors $B_h, B_{h'}$ cannot have a common focus because $\det W \neq 0$. Hence, their complex spines C, C' intersect in a single point $\{p_2\} := C \cap C'$. Denote by R, R' the real spines of $B_h, B_{h'}$.

Suppose that $p_2 \notin R \cup R'$. Reflecting p_2 in R and in R', we obtain by Lemma 2.12 the points $p_1 \in C$ and $p_3 \in C'$ such that $h = \langle -, p_1\rangle p_1 - \langle -, p_2\rangle p_2$ and $h' = \langle -, p_2\rangle p_2 - \langle -, p_3\rangle p_3$. Thus, we arrive at the first alternative.

Since p_2 is the point polar to the projective line joining the foci of $B_h, B_{h'}$, the inclusion $p_2 \in R \cup R'$ is equivalent to the fact that one of the bisectors $B_h, B_{h'}$ contains the focus of the other.

If $p_2 \in R \cap R'$, then $B_h, B_{h'}$ have a common slice S and, by Remark 4.1, $\det W = 0$, a contradiction.

So, we can assume that $p_2 \in R \setminus R'$, i.e., that B_h contains the focus of $B_{h'}$. By Remark 2.3 and Lemma 2.12, $h = \langle -, p_1\rangle i p_2 - \langle -, p_2\rangle i p_1$ and $h' = \langle -, p_2\rangle p_2 - \langle -, p_3\rangle p_3$, where $p_1 \in R$ and p_1, p_2, p_3 are not on a same projective line. In terms of the bases q_1, q_2, q_3 and p_1, p_2, p_3, where $\big[\langle q_i, p_j\rangle\big] = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, we have $hx + h'x' = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & -ix & 0 \\ ix & x' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -x' \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ ∎

5.2. Remark. *Let W be an elliptic family of bisectors. Any rank 1 point in $\hat{E}_W$ is a complex point of a confocal line included in E_W; there are exactly two rank 1 points in $\hat{E}_W$ if there is a confocal line inside E_W.*

Proof. Since $h^* = h$ for any $h \in W$, it follows that $W \cap iW = 0$. Let $h := h_0 + ih_1 = \langle -, q_1\rangle q_0$ be a rank 1 point in $\hat{E}_W$, $h_0, h_1 \in W$. Then $2h_0 = h^* + h = \langle -, q_0\rangle q_1 + \langle -, q_1\rangle q_0$ and $2h_1 = i(h^* - h) =$

$\langle -, q_0\rangle iq_1 - \langle -, q_1\rangle iq_0$. Consequently, h_0, h_1 have rank 2 and span a confocal line U of bisectors included in E_W. As $\operatorname{tr} h = 0$ implies $\langle q_0, q_1\rangle = 0$, we obtain $B_U = S_0 \cup S_1$ by Lemma 4.3.1, where S_0, S_1 are orthogonal projective lines with the polar points q_0, q_1. There is at most one confocal line in E_W. Therefore, $\langle -, q_0\rangle q_1$ and $\langle -, q_1\rangle q_0$ are unique rank 1 points in $\hat{E}_W$ ■

Proof of Lemma 1.2.6. Due to Remark 5.2, by sending $\hat{h} \in \hat{E}_W$ to its kernel, we obtain an algebraic morphism $f : \hat{E}_W \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$. Let $\hat{W} := W + iW \subset \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V)$ and let $\hat{L}_1 \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}\hat{W}$ be a comple projective line such that $\hat{L}_1(e) = 0$ for some $e \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$. Since W contains no confocal line, $\hat{L}_1$ is not defined over $\mathbb{R}$. Hence, $\hat{E}_W = \hat{L} \cup \hat{L}_1 \cup \hat{L}_2$, where the complex projective line $\hat{L}_2$ is 'conjugate' to $\hat{L}_1$ and the complex projective line $\hat{L}$ is defined over $\mathbb{R}$. Denote by $L \subset E_W$ the real projective line formed by the real points of $\hat{L}$. The point $\{p\} := \hat{L}_1 \cap \hat{L}_2$ is real and $\hat{L}_i$ cannot contain any other real point. If $p \notin L$, then $E_W = L \cup \{p\}$ which contradicts the assumptions of Lemma 1.2.6. If $p \in L$, then $E_W = L$ and there are no 3 noncollinear points in E_W.

Thus, the inverse algebraic morphism is well defined. ■

5.3. Lemma. *Let W be an equitant elliptic family of bisectors. Then W is real. Any real projective line $L \subset E_W$ is spanned by a pair of bisectors given by $w_1 - w_2, w_3 - w_4$; $w_1 - w_3, w_2 - w_4$; $w_1 - w_4, w_2 - w_3$. If E_W is reducible, then E_W is a smooth real conic plus a real projective line intersecting the conic in 2 points or E_W consists of 3 real projective lines sharing no common point.*

Proof. The listed pairs are the only pairs of the 6 distinct bisectors given by $w_i - w_j$, $i \neq j$, that can belong to a real projective line $L \subset E_W$ included in E_W because, as observed in 1.2.8, $\sum_{i=1}^{3} r_i w_i$ (for example) has rank 3 if $\sum_{i=1}^{3} r_i = 0$ and $r_i \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. On the other hand, the 3 distinct bisectors given by $w_1 - w_2, w_2 - w_3, w_3 - w_1$ lie on a real projective line L'. Since $L \cap L' \neq \varnothing$, the bisector given, say, by $w_1 - w_2$ belongs to L. For a similar reason, one of the bisectors given by $w_2 - w_3, w_3 - w_4, w_4 - w_2$ belongs to L. So, L is spanned by the bisectors given by $w_1 - w_2, w_3 - w_4$.

We conclude that E_W can neither be a line plus a point, nor a double line plus a line. Let $L \subset E_W$ be a confocal line. No pair can belong to L because the p_i's are not on a same complex projective line. Therefore, W is generic.

The foci of the bisectors given by $w_1 - w_2, w_1 - w_3, w_1 - w_4$ belong to the complex projective line L with the polar point p_1. If $L \subset E$, then $L = f\hat{C}$ for some irreducible component $\hat{C}$ of $\hat{E}_W$ containing the mentioned 3 bisectors. The foci of the other 3 bisectors do not belong L (if the focus q of the bisector given, say, by $w_3 - w_4$ belongs to L, then q is orthogonal to p_1, p_3, p_4, a contradiction), and $\hat{C}$ cannot be a complex projective line. Hence, the other 3 bisectors have to belong to another component $\hat{C}'$ of $\hat{E}_W$ which has to be a complex projective line, a contradiction. Consequently, W is real.

E_W cannot be 3 real projective lines passing through a point because these 3 lines are spanned by the mentioned 3 pairs of bisectors, hence, their common point $\sum_{i=1}^{4} r_i w_i$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{4} r_i = 0$ and $r_i + r_j = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

The remaining case when E_W is a smooth real conic plus a real projective line is considered in the following lemma.

5.4. Lemma. *Let W be an equitant elliptic family of bisectors. A point $h \in E_W$ is singular iff the focus of B_h belongs to B_W.*

Suppose that W is spanned by $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in E_W$ and let $s \in B_W \setminus \mathbb{S}V$. Then the bisectors B_{h_i} are not transversal at s iff s is the focus of a singular point of E_W.

Keeping the w_i's, we can choose representative of the p_i's and their order so that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4 > 0$ in a essentially unique $\mathbb{C}$-linear dependence $\sum_{i=1}^{4} a_i p_i = 0$ between the p_i's. Then one of the following alternatives takes place.

• *$a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4$, E_W is formed by 3 real projective lines, the foci s_1, s_2, s_3 of the pairwise intersections of these lines are given by $\langle s_1, p_1\rangle = \langle s_1, p_2\rangle = -\langle s_1, p_3\rangle = -\langle s_1, p_4\rangle$, $\langle s_2, p_1\rangle = -\langle s_2, p_2\rangle =$*

$\langle s_2, p_3\rangle = -\langle s_2, p_4\rangle$, $\langle s_3, p_1\rangle = -\langle s_3, p_2\rangle = -\langle s_3, p_3\rangle = \langle s_3, p_4\rangle$.

• *$a_1 = a_2 > a_3 = a_4$, E_W is a smooth conic plus a real projective line transversal to the conic, the foci s_1, s_2 of the 2 intersection points of the conic and the line are given by $\langle s_1, p_1\rangle = -\langle s_1, p_2\rangle = \langle s_1, p_3\rangle = -\langle s_1, p_4\rangle$ and $\langle s_2, p_1\rangle = -\langle s_2, p_2\rangle = -\langle s_2, p_3\rangle = \langle s_2, p_4\rangle$.*

• *$a_1 + a_4 = a_2 + a_3$, $a_1 \neq a_2$, E_W is an irreducible singular cubic, the focus s of the singular point of E_W is given by $\langle s, p_1\rangle = -\langle s, p_2\rangle = -\langle s, p_3\rangle = \langle s, p_4\rangle$.*

• *$a_1 = a_2 + a_3 + a_4$, E_W is an irreducible singular cubic, the focus s of the singular point of E_W is given by $\langle s, p_1\rangle = -\langle s, p_2\rangle = -\langle s, p_3\rangle = -\langle s, p_4\rangle$.*

• *$a_1 + a_4 \neq a_2 + a_3$, $a_1 \neq a_2 + a_3 + a_4$, E_W is a smooth cubic.*

Proof. The point h is singular iff a generic real projective line passing through h intersects E_W in at most 2 points (not counting multiplicities). Thus, the first claim follows from Remark 5.1.

By Remark 1.2.1, the bisectors are not transversal at s iff s is a focus of some bisector B_h of the family, implying the second claim.

The fact that $s \in B_W$ is a focus of some bisector in W means that $\big|\langle s, p_1\rangle\big| = \big|\langle s, p_2\rangle\big| = \big|\langle s, p_3\rangle\big| = \big|\langle s, p_4\rangle\big|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 r_i\langle s, p_i\rangle p_i = 0$ for suitable nontrivial r_i's such that $\sum_{i=1}^4 r_i = 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\langle s, p_1\rangle = 1$ and $r_1 = a_1$. Then the conditions take the form $\langle s, p_i\rangle =: \varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ with $r_i = \varepsilon_i a_i$ for all $i = 2, 3, 4$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i a_i = 0$. The last equality guarantees the existence and uniqueness of $s \in V$ for given ε_i's.

Let $L \subset E_W$ be a real projective line containing the bisectors B_1 and B_2 given by $w_i - w_j$ and $w_k - w_l$. As B_1, B_2 have a common slice spanned by their foci $q_1 \neq q_2$, we obtain $\big|\langle q_2, p_i\rangle\big| = \big|\langle q_2, p_j\rangle\big| \neq 0$. From $a_i\langle q_2, p_i\rangle + a_j\langle q_2, p_j\rangle = 0$, we conclude that $a_i = a_j$ and, by symmetry, $a_k = a_l$.

Now we can see that the cases when E_W contains a real projective line are listed in the first 2 alternatives.

Taking into account that the singular point of an irreducible singular real cubic is real, we arrive at the remaining 3 alternatives ■ ■

Proof of Proposition 1.2.9. Let W be a real elliptic family of bisectors and let $L \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$, $L \not\subset E$, be a complex projective line containing the foci of 3 distinct bisectors $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in E_W$. The point p polar to L is a common point of the complex spines C_1, C_2, C_3 of $B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}, B_{h_3}$. Denote by $R_i \subset C_i$ the real spine of B_{h_i}. Since $f : \hat{E}_W \to E \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$ is an isomorphism, the C_i's are pairwise distinct.

Suppose that $p \in R_1 \cap R_2 \cap R_3$. Then the bisectors $B_{h_1}, B_{h_2}, B_{h_3}$ have a common slice. If h_1, h_2, h_3 are not collinear, it follows from (3.6) and Remark 4.1 that $\det W = 0$, a contradiction. If all 3 belong to a nonconfocal real projective line $L' \subset E_W$, the component $f\hat{L}'$ of E has at least 3 common points with L. As $f\hat{L}' \neq E$, we conclude that $E \supset f\hat{L}' = L$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $R_1 \cap R_2 \ni p \notin R_3$. Then the bisectors B_{h_1}, B_{h_2} generate a nonconfocal real projective line $L' \subset E_W$ and $fL' \subset L$ by the beginning of 4.5, hence, $f\hat{L}' = L$, implying $L \subset E$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $p \notin R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R_3$. By reflecting $p_4 := p$ in R_i (see Lemma 2.12), we get $p_i \in C_i$ such that $h_i = \langle -, p_i\rangle p_i - \langle -, p_4\rangle p_4$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. The only 3 points among the p_i's that can belong to a same complex projective line are p_2, p_3, p_4. In this case, the bisectors $B_{h_1 - h_2}, B_{h_2 - h_3}, B_{h_3 - h_1}$ are confocal. So, they have to coincide. In the pairs of points p_2, p_3, p_3, p_4, p_4, p_2, one point is the other reflected in the real spine of this bisector. This implies $p_2 = p_3 = p_4$, a contradiction. Consequently, W is equitant from the p_i's.

We will reduce the remaining case $R_3 \ni p \notin R_1 \cup R_2$, to the previous one. Since the points $fh_1, fh_2, fh_3 \in E \cap L$ are pairwise distinct, they are smooth in E, hence, the points $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in E_W$ are smooth in E_W. Denote by L_i the real projective line joining h_i and h_3, $i = 1, 2$, and by L_3, the real projective line joining h_1 and h_2. By Lemma 5.1, the relation $R_3 \ni p \notin R_1 \cup R_2$ means exactly that $L_i \cap E_W = 2h_i + h_3$ for all $i = 1, 2$, i.e., that L_i is tangent to E_W at h_i and $L_i \not\subset E_W$

Suppose that E_W is irreducible. Then, using the standard arguments involving linear systems of divisors, we will 'move' h_1, h_2, h_3 so that the relation of the type $R_3 \ni p \notin R_1 \cup R_2$ will disappear. As E_W is infinite and, for a given smooth point $h \in E_W$, there are at most 4 nonsingular points $h' \in E_W \setminus \{h\}$ such that the real projective line joining h and h' is tangent to E_W at h', we can pick a smooth point $h'_3 \in E_W \setminus \big(L_3 \cup \{h_3\}\big)$ such that the real projective line L'_i joining $h_i \in L_3$ and h'_3 is not tangent to E_W at h'_3 for all $i = 1, 2$. As $h'_3 \neq h_3$, the line L'_i is not tangent to E_W at any point. Hence, $L'_2 \cap E_W = h_2 + h'_2 + h'_3$ for a suitable smooth point $h'_2 \in E_W$, where h_2, h'_2, h'_3 are distinct. The points h_1, h'_2, h'_3 could not be on a same real projective line because such a line should coincide with L'_2 and then with L_3, which would contradict $h'_3 \notin L_3$. Since $h_1, h'_3 \in L'_1$, $h'_2, h'_3 \in L'_2$, and L'_1, L'_2 are not tangent to E_W at any point, it remains to show that fh_1 lies on the complex projective line $L' \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$ joining fh'_2, fh'_3.

Denote by l_2, l'_2 the linear forms providing the lines $\hat{L}_2, \hat{L}'_2$ and by l, l', the linear forms providing the lines $L, L' \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V$. Clearly, $\varphi := l_2/l'_2$ and $\psi := l/l'$ are nonnull rational functions respectively on $\hat{E}_W$ and E that are regular and invertible at the singular point, if it exists. For a suitable smooth point $q \in L' \cap E$, the divisors of φ and ψ are $h_2 + h_3 - h'_2 - h'_3$ and $fh_1 + fh_2 + fh_3 - q - fh'_2 - fh'_3$, hence, $q - fh_1$ is the divisor of $f_*\varphi/\psi$. For an irreducible cubic, this is well known to imply $q = fh_1$, and we are done.

Suppose that E_W is reducible. Since $E_W \not\supset L_i$ is tangent to E_W for $i = 1, 2$, the cubic E_W should consist of a real smooth conic C and a real projective line R, $E_W = C \cup R$, so that $h_1, h_2 \in C \setminus R$ and $h_3 \in R \setminus C$. As above, $h_i = \langle -, p_i\rangle p_i - \langle -, p_3\rangle p_3$ for $i = 1, 2$ by Lemma 2.12, where $p_3 := p$, and $h_3 = \langle -, p_3\rangle ip_4 - \langle -, p_4\rangle ip_3$ by Remark 2.3, where $p_3, p_4 \in R_3$ and $\langle p_3, p_4\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, p_1, p_2, p_3 are $\mathbb{C}$-linearly independent. We can choose representatives of p_1, p_2 such that $p_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i p_i$ with $a_1, a_2 \geq 0$; denote $a := \operatorname{Im} a_3$. We define the basis q_1, q_2, q_3 in V by means of $\big[\langle q_i, p_j\rangle\big] = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. In terms of the bases q_1, q_2, q_3 and p_1, p_2, p_3, we have $x_1h_1x + x_2h_2 + x_3h_3 = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} x_1 & 0 & ia_1x_3 \\ 0 & x_2 & ia_2x_3 \\ -ia_1x_3 & -ia_2x_3 & -x_1-x_2-2ax_3 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Consequently, E_W is given by the equation $x_1x_2(x_1 + x_2 + 2ax_3) + (a_1^2x_2 + a_2^2x_1)x_3^2 = 0$ and R, by the equation of the form $b_1x_2 + b_2x_1 = 0$. If $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, E_W would be formed by 3 real projective lines. Hence, we can assume that $b_i := a_i^2$ and $x_1x_2(x_1 + x_2 + 2ax_3)$ should be divisible by $a_1^2x_2 + a_2^2x_1$. Up to symmetry, either $a_1 = a_2 \neq 0 = a$ or $a_1 \neq 0 = a_2$. In the second case, the point h_1 does not satisfy the equation $x_1(x_1 + x_2 + 2ax_3) + a_1^2x_3^2 = 0$ of C. In the first case, we can take a suitable representative of p_4 providing $a_1 = a_2 = 1$. Thus, C is given by $x_1x_2 + x_3^2 = 0$ and R, by $x_1 + x_2 = 0$. The points $q_2, 2q_1 - 2q_2 + iq_3, 4q_1 - q_2 + 2iq_3$ are the foci of the bisectors given by h_1, $h'_2 := h_1 - h_2 + 2h_3$, $h'_3 := h_1 - 4h_2 + 2h_3$. These foci lie on a same complex projective line not included in E. The points $h_2, h'_2, h'_3 \in E_W$ are collinear as well as the points $h_1, 2h_1 - 2h_2 + h_3, h'_3 \in E_W$.

The converse follows from Lemma 5.3 ■

Let W be an elliptic family of bisectors equitant from normalized points $p_i \in V$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, of signature σ, $\langle p_i, p_i\rangle = \sigma$. As in Lemma 5.4, we assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4 > 0$ in an essentially unique $\mathbb{C}$-linear dependence $\sum_{i=1}^{4} a_i p_i = 0$ between the p_i's.

Proof of Proposition 1.2.10. Since $B_W = \Big\{q \mid \big|\langle q, p_1\rangle\big| = \big|\langle q, p_2\rangle\big| = \big|\langle q, p_3\rangle\big| = \big|\langle q, p_4\rangle\big|\Big\}$, in terms of the coordinates $x_i := \langle -, p_i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, we have

$$B_W = \big\{[x_1, x_2, 1] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}V \mid |x_1| = |x_2| = 1,\ |a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3| = a_4\big\}.$$

Let $x_1 := \frac{(s_0+is_1)^2}{s_0^2+s_1^2}$ and $x_2 := \frac{(t_0+it_1)^2}{t_0^2+t_1^2}$ with $s_0, s_1, t_0, t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, thus providing $|x_1| = |x_2| = 1$. Then the condition $|a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3|^2 = a_4^2$ means that

$$(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 - a_4^2)(s_0^2 + s_1^2)(t_0^2 + t_1^2) + 2a_1a_2\big((s_0t_0 + s_1t_1)^2 - (s_0t_1 - s_1t_0)^2\big) +$$

$$+2a_1a_3(s_0^2-s_1^2)(t_0^2+t_1^2)+2a_2a_3(t_0^2-t_1^2)(s_0^2+s_1^2)=0,$$

i.e., $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$, where

$$p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1):=r_{00}s_0^2t_0^2+r_{01}s_0^2t_1^2+2s_0s_1t_0t_1+r_{10}s_1^2t_0^2+r_{11}s_1^2t_1^2$$

and

$$r_{00}:=\frac{(a_1+a_2+a_3+a_4)(a_1+a_2+a_3-a_4)}{4a_1a_2},\quad r_{01}:=\frac{(a_1-a_2+a_3+a_4)(a_1-a_2+a_3-a_4)}{4a_1a_2},$$

$$r_{10}:=\frac{(a_1-a_2-a_3+a_4)(a_1-a_2-a_3-a_4)}{4a_1a_2},\quad r_{11}:=\frac{(a_1+a_2-a_3+a_4)(a_1+a_2-a_3-a_4)}{4a_1a_2}.$$

First, we are going to understand when $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ has a linear factor. If $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ is divisible by $c_0s_0+c_1s_1$, then

$$p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=(c_0s_0+c_1s_1)\big(s_0q_0(t_0,t_1)+s_1q_1(t_0,t_1)\big)=$$

$$=s_0s_1\big(c_0q_1(t_0,t_1)+c_1q_0(t_0,t_1)\big)+c_0s_0^2q_0(t_0,t_1)+c_1s_1^2q_1(t_0,t_1),$$

implying

$$c_0q_0(t_0,t_1)=r_{00}t_0^2+r_{01}t_1^2,\qquad c_1q_1(t_0,t_1)=r_{10}t_0^2+r_{11}t_1^2,\qquad c_0q_1(t_0,t_1)+c_1q_0(t_0,t_1)=2t_0t_1.$$

If $q_0(t_0,t_1)$ has the term t_0t_1, then $c_0=0$ and $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ is divisible by s_1. Otherwise, $q_1(t_0,t_1)$ has the term t_0t_1, implying that $c_1=0$ and that $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ is divisible by s_0. By symmetry between s_0,s_1 and t_0,t_1, we conclude that only s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1 can be linear divisors of $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$, providing the following cases:

$$r_{00}=r_{01}=0,\qquad r_{00}=r_{10}=0,\qquad r_{01}=r_{11}=0,\qquad r_{10}=r_{11}=0.$$

The equality $r_{00}=0$ is impossible in view of $a_1\geq a_2\geq a_3\geq a_4>0$. If $r_{11}=0$, then $a_1=a_2=a_3=a_4$ and, by Lemma 5.4, the family is formed by 3 lines, i.e., E_W is reducible.

Assume now that $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ has no linear factor. A decomposition of $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ of the bihomogeneous type $(2,0)+(0,2)$ would imply a factor of degree 1. So, if $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ is reducible, then $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=\big(s_0p_0(t_0,t_1)+s_1p_1(t_0,t_1)\big)\big(s_0q_0(t_0,t_1)+s_1q_1(t_0,t_1)\big)$ and

$$p_0(t_0,t_1)q_0(t_0,t_1)=r_{00}t_0^2+r_{01}t_1^2,\qquad p_1(t_0,t_1)q_1(t_0,t_1)=r_{10}t_0^2+r_{11}t_1^2,$$

$$p_0(t_0,t_1)q_1(t_0,t_1)+p_1(t_0,t_1)q_0(t_0,t_1)=2t_0t_1.$$

Since $p_0(t_0,t_1),p_1(t_0,t_1),q_0(t_0,t_1),q_1(t_0,t_1)\neq 0$, we obtain

$$p_i(t_0,t_1)=\alpha_i(\beta_{i0}t_0+\beta_{i1}t_1),\qquad q_i(t_0,t_1)=\alpha_i^{-1}(\beta_{i0}t_0-\beta_{i1}t_1)$$

for suitable $\alpha_i\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\beta_{ij}\in\mathbb{R}\cup i\mathbb{R}$ such that $\beta_{i0}^2=r_{i0}$ and $\beta_{i1}^2=-r_{i1}$. Thus,

$$(\alpha_0\alpha_1^{-1}+\alpha_0^{-1}\alpha_1)\beta_{00}\beta_{10}=0,\qquad (\alpha_0\alpha_1^{-1}+\alpha_0^{-1}\alpha_1)\beta_{01}\beta_{11}=0,$$

$$(\alpha_0^{-1}\alpha_1-\alpha_0\alpha_1^{-1})(\beta_{00}\beta_{11}-\beta_{01}\beta_{10})=2.$$

If $\alpha_0\alpha_1^{-1}+\alpha_0^{-1}\alpha_1\neq 0$, then $r_{01}=0$, i.e., $a_1=a_2$ and $a_3=a_4$. By Lemma 5.4, E_W is reducible. Therefore, $\alpha_0\alpha_1^{-1}+\alpha_0^{-1}\alpha_1=0$. It follows that $\alpha_1=\pm i\alpha_0$ and $\beta_{00}\beta_{11}-\beta_{01}\beta_{10}=\mp i$. Without loss of generality, we take $\alpha_0=1$ and $\alpha_1=i$. Then

$$p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=d(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)q(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1),$$

where

$$d(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1):=\beta_{00}s_0t_0+\beta_{01}s_0t_1+i\beta_{10}s_1t_0+i\beta_{11}s_1t_1,$$

$$q(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1):=\beta_{00}s_0t_0-\beta_{01}s_0t_1-i\beta_{10}s_1t_0+i\beta_{11}s_1t_1.$$

Since $q(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=d(s_0,-s_1,t_0,-t_1)$, we study only zeros of $d(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$.

The equation $d(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$ can be written as $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}s_0 & s_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a_{00} & a_{01}\\ a_{10} & a_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left[\begin{smallmatrix}t_0\\ t_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]=0$, where $a_{0i}:=\beta_{0i}$ and $a_{1i}:=i\beta_{1i}$. It follows from $\beta_{00}\beta_{11}-\beta_{01}\beta_{10}=-i$ that $\det\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a_{00} & a_{01}\\ a_{10} & a_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right]=1$.

Suppose that the equation $d(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$ admits infinitely many solutions in $\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathbb{R}}\times\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since, for a given $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}s_0 & s_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]$, there is an essentially unique $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}t_0 & t_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ subject to the equation, we only need to study if $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}s_0 & s_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a_{00} & a_{01}\\ a_{10} & a_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ is proportional to a real one for infinitely many (hence, for all) nonproportional real $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}s_0 & s_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. (In particular, this implies that $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a_{00} & a_{01}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ and $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a_{10} & a_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ are proportional to real ones.) Taking $a_{ij}\in\mathbb{R}\cup i\mathbb{R}$ into account, we conclude that the a_{ij}'s are all real or they are all purely imaginary. In other words, $\pm p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=(b_{00}s_0t_0+b_{11}s_1t_1)^2-(b_{01}s_0t_1+b_{10}s_1t_0)^2$ with $b_{ij}\in\mathbb{R}$. Since $r_{00}>0$, the sign in $\pm p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$ is $+$. So, $r_{01}=-b_{01}^2\leq 0$, a contradiction.

By Lemma 5.4, any point $p\in B_W\cap\mathbb{B}V$ different from the focus of a singular point of E_W provides infinitely many points in B_W close to p. So, if $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$ admits only finitely many solutions in $\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathbb{R}}\times\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathbb{R}}$, then $a_1+a_4=a_2+a_3$ or $a_1=a_2+a_3+a_4$ by Lemma 5.4. Hence, $\beta_{10}=0$, and it follows from $\beta_{00}\beta_{11}-\beta_{01}\beta_{10}=-i$ that $r_{00}r_{11}=1$. If $a_4=a_2+a_3-a_1$, then $r_{00}r_{11}=\frac{(a_2+a_3)(a_1-a_3)}{a_1a_2}$. Therefore, $(a_1-a_2-a_3)a_3=0$, implying $a_1-a_2-a_3=0$ and $a_4=0$, a contradiction. If $a_4=a_1-a_2-a_3$, then $r_{00}r_{11}=\frac{(a_2+a_3)(a_1-a_3)}{a_1a_2}$. Consequently, $(a_1-a_2-a_3)a_3=0$ and again $a_4=0$, a contradiction. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.2.11. Take $h\in\mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{C}}(V,V)$ such that $h^*=h$ and $\langle hb,b\rangle=0$ for all $b\in B$. In terms of the coordinates x_i's introduced at the beginning of the proof of Proposition 1.2.10, the hermitian form $[u,v]:=\langle hu,v\rangle$ has a hermitian matrix $[h_{jk}]$. By Proposition 1.2.10, $x_1:=\frac{(s_0+is_1)^2}{s_0^2+s_1^2}$ and $x_2:=\frac{(t_0+it_1)^2}{t_0^2+t_1^2}$ subject to $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$ provide an irreducible curve. Since B is Zariski dense in this curve, the equality $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)=0$ implies $h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2\,\mathrm{Re}(h_{12}x_1\overline{x}_2+h_{23}x_2+h_{31}\overline{x}_1)=0$. In terms of s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1, it takes the form

$$(h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33})(s_0^2+s_1^2)(t_0^2+t_1^2)+2h^0_{12}\big((s_0t_0+s_1t_1)^2-(s_0t_1-s_1t_0)^2\big)+4h^1_{12}(s_0t_0+s_1t_1)(s_0t_1-s_1t_0)+$$

$$+2h^0_{23}(s_0^2+s_1^2)(t_0^2-t_1^2)-4h^1_{23}(s_0^2+s_1^2)t_0t_1+2h^0_{31}(s_0^2-s_1^2)(t_0^2+t_1^2)+4h^1_{31}s_0s_1(t_0^2+t_1^2)=0,$$

where $h_{jk}=h^0_{jk}+ih^1_{jk}$ with $h^0_{jk},h^1_{jk}\in\mathbb{R}$. Hence,

$$(h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{12}+2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31})s_0^2t_0^2+(h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{12}-2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31})s_0^2t_1^2+8h^0_{12}s_0s_1t_0t_1+$$

$$+(h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{12}+2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31})s_1^2t_0^2+(h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{12}-2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31})s_1^2t_1^2+$$
$$+4(h^1_{12}-h^1_{23})s_0^2t_0t_1+4(h^1_{31}-h^1_{12})s_0s_1t_0^2+4(h^1_{12}+h^1_{31})s_0s_1t_1^2-4(h^1_{12}+h^1_{23})s_1^2t_0t_1=0.$$

By Proposition 1.2.10, the left-hand side should be proportional to $p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$. In particular, $h^1_{12}=h^1_{23}=h^1_{31}=0$.

If $h^0_{12}=0$, then

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31}=0,\qquad h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31}=0,$$

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31}=0,\qquad h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31}=0,$$

implying $h^0_{23}=h^0_{31}=0$ and $h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}=0$. In this case h belongs to the $\mathbb{R}$-span of w_1-w_2 and w_2-w_3.

If $h^0_{12}\neq 0$, we can assume that the left-hand side is equal to $4a_1a_2p(s_0,s_1,t_0,t_1)$. Hence,

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{12}+2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31}=(a_1+a_2+a_3+a_4)(a_1+a_2+a_3-a_4),$$

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{12}-2h^0_{23}+2h^0_{31}=(a_1-a_2+a_3+a_4)(a_1-a_2+a_3-a_4),$$

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}-2h^0_{12}+2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31}=(a_1-a_2-a_3+a_4)(a_1-a_2-a_3-a_4),$$

$$h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}+2h^0_{12}-2h^0_{23}-2h^0_{31}=(a_1+a_2-a_3+a_4)(a_1+a_2-a_3-a_4),$$

$$h^1_{12}=h^1_{23}=h^1_{31}=0,\qquad h^0_{12}=a_1a_2.$$

Subtracting the second equality from the first one and taking into account the last one, we obtain $h^0_{23}=a_2a_3$. Subtracting the second equality from the fourth one and taking into account the last one, we obtain $h^0_{31}=a_3a_1$. Now it is clear that $h_{11}+h_{22}+h_{33}=a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2-a_4^2$ and that $[h_{jk}]=\left[\begin{smallmatrix} h_{11} & a_1a_2 & a_1a_3\\ a_2a_1 & h_{22} & a_2a_3\\ a_3a_1 & a_3a_2 & h_{33}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $a_4=1$. Then the matrix of the hermitian form $[u,v]_4:=\langle w_4u,v\rangle=\langle u,p_4\rangle\langle p_4,v\rangle$ equals $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a_1^2 & a_1a_2 & a_1a_3\\ a_2a_1 & a_2^2 & a_2a_3\\ a_3a_1 & a_3a_2 & a_3^2\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. So, $h=w_4+\sum_{i=1}^3(h_{ii}-a_i^2)w_i$. It remains to observe that $1+\sum_{i=1}^3(h_{ii}-a_i^2)=0$ ∎

6. Appendix: Proof of Theorem 1.3.2

6.1. Lemma. *Let $L,M\subset\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ be lines, let $p_1,p_2,p_3\in L$, and let $q_1,q_2,q_3\in M$. Suppose that no other 3 points among p_1,p_2,p_3,q_1,q_2,q_3 lie on a line and that neither $p'_1,p'_2,p'_3\in\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ nor $q'_1,q'_2,q'_3\in\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ lie on a line. Then the points $p_i\otimes p'_i$, $q_j\otimes q'_j$, $i,j=1,2,3$, are $\mathbb{K}$-linearly independent and span $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K\subset\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A\otimes_{\mathbb{K}}A)$ such that $(L\times\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A)\cap\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$ consists only of the points $p_i\otimes p'_i$, $i=1,2,3$.*

Proof. We can assume that $\sum_i p_i=\sum_j q_j=0$ and $q_2=ap_1+p_2+bq_1$, $a,b\in\mathbb{K}$. Since neither p_1,p_2,q_2 nor p_1,p_2,q_3 lie on a same line, we have $b\neq 0,-1$. Suppose that

$$(p_1+cp_2)\otimes d=\sum_i p_i\otimes a_ip'_i+\sum_j q_j\otimes b_jq'_j.$$

Then $p_1\otimes d_1+p_2\otimes d_2+q_1\otimes(b_1q'_1-b_3q'_3+bb_2q'_2-bb_3q'_3)=0$ for suitable $d_1,d_2\in A$. Since p_1,p_2,q_1 are not on a same line, we obtain $b_1q'_1+bb_2q'_2-(1+b)b_3q'_3=0$. As q'_1,q'_2,q'_3 are not on a same line and $b\neq 0,-1$, we obtain $b_1=b_2=b_3=0$ and $p_1\otimes d+p_2\otimes cd=\sum_i p_i\otimes a_ip'_i=p_1\otimes(a_1p'_1-a_3p'_3)+p_2\otimes(a_2p'_2-a_3p'_3)$, implying $d=a_1p'_1-a_3p'_3$ and $cd=a_2p'_2-a_3p'_3$. As p'_1,p'_2,p'_3 are not on a same line, we conclude that $a_2=0$. Furthermore, either $c=a_3=0$ or $c\neq 0=a_1$ and $-ca_3=-a_3$. In the first case, we obtain $(p_1+cp_2)\otimes d=p_1\otimes a_1p'_1$. In the second case, we get $c=1$ and $(p_1+cp_2)\otimes d=p_3\otimes a_3p'_3$ ∎

6.2. Lemma. *Let $\varphi_i: D\hookrightarrow\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$, $i=1,2$, be isomorphisms with plane cubics. Then the curve $(\varphi_1\times\varphi_2)D\subset\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A\times\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A\subset\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A\otimes_{\mathbb{K}}A)$ has degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A\otimes_{\mathbb{K}}A)$ and spans a linear subspace of dimension ≤ 5.*

Proof. Any plane cubic D is a Cohen-Macaulay and Gorenstein scheme with the trivial dualizing sheaf. We obtain the usual[2] Riemann-Roch formula $h^0\mathcal{L} - h^0\mathcal{L}^\vee = \deg\mathcal{L}$ valid for every line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ over D and deduce that $h^0\mathcal{L} = \deg\mathcal{L}$ if $\deg\mathcal{L} > 0$. As the embedding $\varphi_i : D \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ is given by a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_i$ of degree 3, the embedding $\varphi_1 \times \varphi_2 : D \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \hookrightarrow P_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$ is given by the line bundle $\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_D} \mathcal{L}_2$ of degree 6. Therefore, the image of $\varphi_1 \times \varphi_2$ lies in a linear subspace of $P_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$ of dimension ≤ 5 ∎

6.3. Lemma. *Up to isotopy, there exists a unique 3-dimensional generic $\mathbb{K}$-algebra whose zero divisors scheme is a line plus a double line; one can take the identity for the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$.*

Proof. We work in terms of the matrix $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ of linear forms in projective coordinates x_0, x_1, x_2 on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ that describe left multiplications by the elements of A. After a suitable isotopy, we can assume that φ provides the identity on the variety given by $x_0x_1 = 0$. So, $\Phi(0, x_1, x_2)\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0$, implying that $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = [*\ f_2x_0 + fx_2\ f_3x_0 - fx_1]$ for some columns $f_2, f_3, f \in \mathbb{K}^3$. From $\Phi(x_0, 0, x_2)\begin{bmatrix} x_0 \\ 0 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0$, we conclude that

$$\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = [f_1x_1 - f_3x_2\ f_2x_0 + fx_2\ f_3x_0 - fx_1]$$

with $f_1, f_2, f_3, f \in \mathbb{K}^3$. Since

$$x_0^2x_1 = \det\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \det[f_1\ f_2\ f_3]x_0^2x_1 - \det[f_1\ f_2\ f]x_0x_1^2 + \det[f_1 + f_2\ f\ f_3]x_0x_1x_2,$$

we obtain $\det[f_1\ f_2\ f_3] = 1$, $\det[f_1\ f_2\ f] = 0$, and $\det[f_1 + f_2\ f\ f_3] = 0$. Acting on $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ by $\mathrm{GL}_3\mathbb{K}$ from the left, we can assume that $[f_1\ f_2\ f_3] = 1$ and infer that f has the form $f = \begin{bmatrix} k \\ k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $k \in \mathbb{K}$. Therefore, $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & kx_2 & -kx_1 \\ 0 & x_0{+}kx_2 & -kx_1 \\ -x_2 & 0 & x_0 \end{bmatrix}$. Since $\Phi(0, 0, 1)$ has rank 2, we have $k \neq 0$. After elementary transformations, we obtain $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \begin{bmatrix} kx_1 & kx_2 & -kx_1 \\ -kx_1 & x_0 & 0 \\ -kx_2 & 0 & x_0 \end{bmatrix}$. Denoting by x_1, x_2 the former kx_1, kx_2, we get $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & -x_1 \\ x_1 & x_0 & 0 \\ -x_2 & 0 & x_0 \end{bmatrix}$. One can easily see that the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ is the identity ∎

6.4. Lemma. *Up to isotopy, there exists a unique 3-dimensional generic $\mathbb{K}$-algebra whose zero divisors scheme is a triple line; one can take the identity for the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$.*

Proof. After a suitable isotopy, we can assume that φ provides the identity on the line of left zero divisors given by $x_0 = 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.3, we have $\Phi(0, x_1, x_2)\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0$, implying that $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = [f_1x_0 + g_1x_1 + g_2x_2\ f_2x_0 + g_3x_2\ f_3x_0 - g_3x_1]$ for $f_i, g_j \in \mathbb{K}^3$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. Since

$$x_0^3 = \det\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \big(\det[g_1\ f_2\ f_3] - \det[f_1\ f_2\ g_3]\big)x_0^2x_1 + \big(\det[g_1\ g_3\ f_3] - \det[g_2\ f_2\ g_3]\big)x_0x_1x_2 +$$

$$+\big(\det[f_1\ g_3\ f_3] + \det[g_2\ f_2\ f_3]\big)x_0^2x_2 - \det[g_1\ f_2\ g_3]x_0x_1^2 + \det[g_2\ g_3\ f_3]x_0x_2^2 + \det[f_1\ f_2\ f_3]x_0^3,$$

after acting on $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ by $\mathrm{GL}_3\mathbb{K}$ from the left, we obtain $[f_1\ f_2\ f_3] = 1$ and

$$g_{11} = g_{33}, \quad g_{11}g_{23} - g_{13}g_{21} = g_{12}g_{33} - g_{13}g_{32}, \quad g_{23} + g_{12} = 0, \quad g_{11}g_{33} = g_{13}g_{31}, \quad g_{12}g_{23} = g_{13}g_{22},$$

[2] I am grateful to Dimitri Markushevich who indicated that the usual Riemann-Roch formula holds for any plane cubic.

where $[g_{ij}] := [g_1\ g_2\ g_3]$. This means that

$$(\mathbf{6.5})\quad [g_1\ g_2\ g_3] = \begin{bmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} & g_{13} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} & -g_{12} \\ g_{31} & g_{32} & g_{11} \end{bmatrix},\ g_{11}^2 = g_{13}g_{31},\ g_{11}g_{12} + g_{13}g_{21} = g_{13}g_{32} - g_{11}g_{12},\ g_{12}^2 + g_{13}g_{22} = 0.$$

If $g_{13} = 0$, we have $g_{11} = g_{12} = g_{13} = 0$ and $\Phi(0, x_1, x_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ g_{21}x_1 + g_{22}x_2 & 0 & 0 \\ g_{31}x_1 + g_{32}x_2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ has rank ≤ 1. Hence, $g_{13} \neq 0$. It follows from (6.5) that

$$[g_1\ 0\ -g_3] \begin{bmatrix} g_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ -g_{12} & g_{13} & 0 \\ g_{11} & 0 & g_{13} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -g_{13}^2 \\ u^2 & 0 & g_{12}g_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & -g_{11}g_{13} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad [g_2\ g_3\ 0] \begin{bmatrix} g_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ -g_{12} & g_{13} & 0 \\ g_{11} & 0 & g_{13} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & g_{13}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -g_{12}g_{13} & 0 \\ u^2 & g_{11}g_{13} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $u^2 := g_{21}g_{13} + g_{12}g_{11} = g_{32}g_{13} - g_{11}g_{12}$. Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} g_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{12} & g_{13} & 0 \\ -g_{11} & 0 & g_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -g_{13}^2 \\ u^2 & 0 & g_{12}g_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & -g_{11}g_{13} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -g_{13}^3 \\ g_{13}u^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \begin{bmatrix} g_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{12} & g_{13} & 0 \\ -g_{11} & 0 & g_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & g_{13}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -g_{12}g_{13} & 0 \\ u^2 & g_{11}g_{13} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & g_{13}^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ g_{13}u^2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2) = [f_1\ f_2\ f_3]x_0 + [g_1\ 0\ -g_3]x_1 + [g_2\ g_3\ 0]x_2$, we obtain

$$\Phi'(x_0, x_1, x_2) := G^{-1}\Phi(x_0, x_1, x_2)G = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & g_{13}x_2 & -g_{13}x_1 \\ u^2g_{13}^{-1}x_1 & x_0 & 0 \\ u^2g_{13}^{-1}x_2 & 0 & x_0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $G := \begin{bmatrix} g_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ -g_{12} & g_{13} & 0 \\ g_{11} & 0 & g_{13} \end{bmatrix}$. If $u = 0$, then $\Phi'(0, x_1, x_2)$ has rank ≤ 1. So, $u \neq 0$. Multiplying the first column, second line, and third line by $u^{-1}g_{13}$ in $\Phi'(x_0, x_1, x_2)$, we arrive at $\begin{bmatrix} u^{-1}g_{13}x_0 & g_{13}x_2 & -g_{13}x_1 \\ g_{13}x_1 & u^{-1}g_{13}x_0 & 0 \\ g_{13}x_2 & 0 & u^{-1}g_{13}x_0 \end{bmatrix}$. Denoting the former $u^{-1}g_{13}x_0, g_{13}x_1, g_{13}x_2$ by x_0, x_1, x_2, we obtain $\begin{bmatrix} x_0 & x_2 & -x_1 \\ x_1 & x_0 & 0 \\ x_2 & 0 & x_0 \end{bmatrix}$. One can easily see that the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ is the identity ■

Proof of Theorem 1.3.2. Up to isotopy, any algebra A can be described by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$, where K stands for the kernel of the multiplication $A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A \dot{\to} A$. In view of the Segre embedding $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$, the scheme D of the pairs of zero divisors equals $D = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$.

One can easily see that the Lie algebra $A := \mathrm{sl}_2\,\mathbb{K}$ is a generic algebra with $D_1 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$; that the scheme D coincides with the diagonal $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$; and that $\Delta = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$ spans $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$, where $K = \mathrm{Sym}^2 A \subset A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A$ is the symmetric square of A, $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} K = 6$. Hence, up to isotopy, $\mathrm{sl}_2\,\mathbb{K}$ is a unique generic algebra with $D_1 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$.

It follows that $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} K = 6$ for any generic algebra. Indeed, if $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} K > 6$, then $D_1 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ and A has to be isotopic to $\mathrm{sl}_2\,\mathbb{K}$, a contradiction.

Let A be a generic 3-dimensional algebra whose D_1 is a reduced cubic, i.e., a cubic without multiple components.

If the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ is projective, we can assume that $D = \Delta_{D_1} := (D_1 \times D_1) \cap \Delta$. A simple straightforward verification shows that Δ_{D_1} spans $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\,\mathrm{Sym}^2 A$ (for a smooth D_1, one may use the Riemann-Roch theorem as above). In other words, we arrive again at $\mathrm{sl}_2\,\mathbb{K}$. A contradiction.

So, we assume that φ is not projective. This implies that, for any 3 distinct points $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in D_1 \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ lying on a same line transversal to D_1, the points $\varphi p_1, \varphi p_2, \varphi p_3 \in D_2 \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ do not lie on a same line. We can choose points $p_i, q_j \in D_1$ with $p_i' := \varphi p_i$ and $q_j' := \varphi q_i$ subject to the conditions of Lemma 6.1 and with L, M transversal to D_1. By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$ is spanned by the pairs $(d_1, \varphi d_1)$, $d_1 \in D_1$.

Conversely, let us be given a nonprojective isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ between reduced cubics. By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, the curve $D' := \{(d_1, \varphi d_1) \mid d_1 \in D_1\}$ of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$ spans a 5-dimensional linear subspace $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$.

For any smooth point $p_1 \in D_1$, there is a line $L \ni p_1$ transversal to D_1. Taking a generic line M transversal to D_1, we conclude from Lemma 6.1 that $(L \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$ consists of 3 points. In particular, $(p_1 \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K = (p_1, \varphi p_1)$ and there is a point in L that is not a left zero divisor of the algebra A given by K. This implies that D_1 is the scheme of left zero divisors of A. By symmetry, D_2 is the scheme of right zero divisors of A.

We need to show that $D' = D := (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$. Since $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}A$ has degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A)$, we can assume that $\dim D \geq 2$. So, $D \supset C_1 \times C_2$, where C_i is a component of D_i. As there is a point $p_1 \in C_1$ that is smooth in D_1 and $p_1 \times C_2 \subset D \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}K$, we arrive at a contradiction.

The remaining case of D_1 with multiple components is considered in Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 ∎

When studying noncommutative projective planes, A. Bondal and A. Polishchuk [BoP] classified the so-called geometric tensors. This classification is almost equivalent to that of generic algebras (see [BoP, Table, p. 36] for details). The algebras given by matrices $\begin{bmatrix} x_0 & 0 & 0 \\ -ux_2 & x_0 & ux_1 \\ -u^{-1}x_1 & u^{-1}x_2 & x_0 \end{bmatrix}$ of linear forms, where $0 \neq u \in \mathbb{K}$, constitute the difference between generic algebras and geometric tensors. In this case, each of D_1, D_2 is a conic plus a line and the isomorphism $\varphi : D_1 \to D_2$ maps the line to the conic and the conic to the line.

References

[AGG] S. Anan′in, C. H. Grossi, N. Gusevskii, *Complex hyperbolic structures on disc bundles over surfaces,* Int. Math. Res. Not. **2011** (2011), no. 19, 4295–4375, see also http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0511741

[AGr] S. Anan′in, C. H. Grossi, *Coordinate-free classic geometries,* Mosc. Math. J. **11** (2011), 633–655, see also http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0702714

[AGS] S. Anan′in, C. H. Grossi, J. S. S. da Silva, *Poincare's polyhedron theorem for cocompact groups in dimension* 4*,* accepted in Mosc. Math. J. (2014), see also http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.5740

[Ana] S. Anan′in, *Research plan for* 2013–2014

[BoP] A. Bondal, A. E. Polishchuk, *Homological properties of associative algebras*: *the method of helices,* Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math. 42:2 (1994), 219–260

[Gol] W. M. Goldman, *Complex hyperbolic geometry,* Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, xx+316 pp.

Departamento de Matemática, ICMC, Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 668, 13560-970–São Carlos–SP, Brasil